

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLVII

JANUARY, 1954

NUMBER 1

THE FOURTH GOSPEL, EPHESUS, AND ALEXANDRIA

H. C. SNAPE

WHALLEY VICARAGE, BLACKBURN, ENGLAND

PROFESSOR Goguel in his 'La Naissance du Christianisme' and Professor Brandon in his 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church' have both put forward new hypotheses, which, if accepted, ask for a new orientation on many of the still unsolved questions of Christian origins. Professor Goguel maintains that the direct evidence in our possession for the history of Christian origins is the residue of a process of selection and interpretation of fact performed by early Catholicism in accordance with its own opinions and beliefs as to its origin. Hence, he claims, the most valuable evidence is to be found in what conflicts with its presuppositions. Early Catholicism presumed that it was the product of an original and ideal unity. But it could not be denied, although Acts tries to gloss over the fact, that Paul and the mother church had been divided. Goguel finds evidence that they were so divided that the Christians in Jerusalem tried to suppress Paul and his teaching and at the outset appeared to succeed. The Jerusalem community, he claims, considered Jesus to have become Messiah after his death when God exalted him to the position; their faith lacked all pneumatism; their emphasis was on Jesus as teacher. They regarded themselves as continuing to be members of the Jewish church and salvation as a Jewish prerogative provided those who had consented to Jesus' death repented of their sin. Paul on the other hand, without denying the importance of the teaching and ministry of Jesus, found the essential significance of Christ's work to lie in his death. Christ crucified was the centre of his preaching.

In Goguel's estimation the church at Jerusalem declined in

influence and ceased to be regarded by Gentile Christians as the mother church not only because Jerusalem itself was destroyed in 70, but also because its own beliefs lost their dynamic. Once it became clear that the parousia was indefinitely delayed, the hope and belief that Jesus would return as the Messiah became feeble and ineffective; he was regarded as nothing more than a second Moses, who had revealed heavenly wisdom.

Professor Brandon, working independently, has arrived at similar conclusions, but what Professor Goguel adumbrates he underlines. He maintains that Paul regarded Palestinian Christianity as a positive rival to his own interpretation of the faith. As a result of the experience of his conversion he made the crucifixion and the resurrection the kernel of his gospel. They were of soteriological and indeed of cosmic significance. On the other hand the Christians at Jerusalem considered a knowledge of the historical Jesus to be of primary importance. They regarded Jesus as the Messiah not because of his crucifixion but in spite of it. Hence the task of their apologetic was not to glory in the cross, but to explain it away. Dr. Brandon — and in this Professor Goguel supports him — maintains that most of the Christians at Jerusalem were allied with the Jews in regarding Paul as a renegade and heretic who had disowned the Law and the Temple. Hence Paul was left in isolation and from the time of his arrest in 55 to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 he suffered a complete eclipse. Dr. Brandon then suggests that the fall of Jerusalem in 70 secured the resurrection of Pauline Christianity, as a result of which the *corpus Paulinum* was made. Then to counter the attacks made on Paulinism that it ignored the historical Jesus, a literary novelty in the form of Mark's gospel was composed. This was later followed by the composition of Acts designed to show that the differences between Paul and Jerusalem were not as serious as had been thought and that the earliest days of the Christian church had been a golden age of harmony and fellowship such as had not been since.

The boldest, however, and most original of Dr. Brandon's suggestions concerns the origin of the church at Alexandria. As is well known there exists no reliable evidence as to its origin, while the earliest direct evidence reveals that by the second century

there existed a large and flourishing church there, distinguished for the vigor of its intellectual life. The reference in Acts to Apollos from Alexandria and his defective knowledge of the new faith by Pauline standards, Dr. Brandon takes to be a disparagement of Alexandrine Christianity. From these two indications in Acts it is inferred that Christianity was brought to Alexandria 'by persons who had learned their faith in Jerusalem and who continued loyal to the Mother Church there' (p. 225). Dr. Brandon then suggests that Matthew's gospel was composed in Alexandria after 70 when it had become the sole inheritor of the Jerusalem tradition and that it was written to counteract the effect of the Markan gospel, which had been produced to depict, as the Son of God and universal Saviour, the historic Jesus on which Palestinian Christianity had laid such emphasis. In support of this hypothesis, Dr. Brandon points to the story of the flight into Egypt and the strong Judaistic interest of the gospel. The elevation of Peter, he suggests, is a counterblow to meet the rising reputation of Paul, assuming that Peter was closely associated with Alexandria.

Dr. Brandon's conclusions may be summed up as (i) that Christianity in Jerusalem remained as a loyal sect within Judaism, differing from it by accepting Jesus as the second Moses and risen Messiah who would come again, (ii) that the church in Alexandria was founded by men who came from Jerusalem, bringing this Judaistic form of the new faith with them, and (iii) that Matthew's gospel was composed in Alexandria about 80 to give Judaistic Christianity a secure position *vis-à-vis* the fall of Jerusalem and the rising tide of Paulinism. It is of course obvious that these bold inferences by no means conclusively overthrow traditional views. As Professor Brandon himself writes, 'The temerity of proposing new and radical solutions of the problems of Christian Origins must be obvious to anyone who has a working knowledge of New Testament studies, and no wise man will lightly undertake the risks involved. . . . Divergence of opinion is inevitable where the data are so ambiguous, and there is no useful alternative to the obvious and usual way of submitting one's interpretation, supported by all the evidence which seems to be relevant, to other scholars and abiding their fair considera-

tion.' (The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church p. x) Bearing in mind these cautionary remarks it seems worth while, however, to see whether the acceptance of Dr. Brandon's hypotheses can throw any light upon the vexed question of the origin and context of the Fourth Gospel and the relationship between the churches of Alexandria and Ephesus, both of which have been suggested as its birth-place.

The earliest reference to the origin of the church at Ephesus is to be found in the passage in Acts telling of the arrival of Apollos from Alexandria and the subsequent discovery by Paul of twelve disciples (mathetai) at Ephesus. Both Apollos and the mathetai knew only of the baptism of John and had not received the Holy Spirit or even heard of him. It may be supposed that the twelve had been baptized by Apollos before he had been instructed by Paul's friends, Prisca and Aquila. It may not be possible to go as far as Loisy and say that Apollos founded the Ephesian church, but it is safe to say that in Apollos and the twelve disciples there existed, at Ephesus, a nucleus of Christians whose faith derived from Alexandria and was found to differ substantially from that maintained by Paul, particularly on the questions of baptism, the relationship between baptism and pneumatism and, also, between Jesus and John the Baptist. The existence of a Paul faction and an Apollos faction at Corinth is shown by the mention of them in I Corinthians. If there existed a faction at Corinth claiming Apollos as its leader, *a fortiori*, a similar faction should have existed in the church at Ephesus, probably stronger in numbers and with stronger claims to possess the true gospel, compared with Paul's version, than at Corinth. For while Apollos was at Corinth the intruder, in Ephesus Paul appeared in that role.

Apollos is described as 'mighty in the scriptures,' 'fervent in spirit,' 'instructed in the way of the Lord,' 'teaching the things concerning Jesus carefully.' Could anyone teach accurately the things concerning Jesus and know only the baptism of John? Dr. Brandon regards this description as a caricature of Alexandrine Christianity. But an examination of the references in the New Testament to baptism seems to show that Luke may not have understood the significance of John's baptism. The account of John's mission in the Lukan gospel reflects the view current when

the gospel was composed, that the baptism of John was only the prototype of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire to be effected by Jesus, and that John and his mission were merely to be the precursor of Jesus. Anyone who taught the things concerning Jesus, but held views of baptism which had survived from what John taught about baptism, would have been thought likely to be defective in Christian teaching.

To understand John's mission fully it has to be recognized that, in the last years of the ancient Hebrew state, political and religious sentiments were inextricably confused in Jewish hearts and minds. Politically the patriotic Jew desired to rid himself of Caesar's rule; his religious vision was the realization of God's kingdom and the reign of the Messiah. Those in authority were unable to differentiate between those who were prepared to wait for God to act and bring in his kingdom, and those who were eager to force the issue by active insurrection. Both parties alike were suspect. The Christians of the first century sought to emphasize the religious nature both of John's and Jesus' mission and to eliminate any possibility that the Christian movement might be thought to have any political implications or, in any way, to lead to a disturbance of the *pax Romana*. Hence, according to the synoptics, John the Baptist made baptism, which was the usual ceremony for the admission of proselytes into the Jewish church, nothing more than a rite of purification and a symbol of repentance, bestowed on those who obeyed his call to prepare themselves for the parousia. But Josephus also informs us that he united those who obeyed and followed him by a baptism, implying that it was a rite of admission into a new society. This may well have been regarded as the remnant which would form the new Israel to be ruled by the Messiah. The early church in Jerusalem, following John's example and influenced by those who had been his followers, would continue the practice of baptism merely as the rite of admission to the new Israel. It is to be noticed that what is regarded as the more primitive of Peter's two speeches in Acts summons the audience 'to repent and be converted' (Acts III, 19) without any mention of baptism at all. If, therefore, missionaries from Jerusalem brought Christianity to Alexandria, it is not unreasonable to suppose that

there also baptism would be only accounted as the rite of admission to the new Israel. An Alexandrian Christian could aptly be described by a Hellenist like Luke as well instructed in the way of the Lord, teaching the things concerning Jesus carefully, but knowing only the baptism of John. Such was Apollos, and such was the apparently defective form of Christianity which he brought to Ephesus.

The Hellenists who first evangelized among the Gentiles, working northward through Samaria into Asia Minor, appear to have adopted the Jewish use of baptism as the ceremony of admission for a proselyte into the synagogue, as the means of admission of the Gentile into the Christian church, but added the use of the formula 'in the name of Jesus.' This seems to be implied by the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts VIII, 38) and that of the Samaritans (Acts VIII, 13). But pneumatism, i.e. the phenomena of religious enthusiasm and ecstasy, in contrast to the church at Jerusalem where it did not appear, was regarded in Asia Minor and Achaëa as the obvious sign of conversion and indeed, according to Paul, was considered by converted Gentiles to be the unique gift of conversion. It cannot be supposed that these spontaneous outbursts of enthusiasm always occurred at the right moment, i.e. the moment of baptism. Hence we have the curious account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household who received the Holy Spirit, i.e. became subject to pneumatic phenomena, before they were baptized, while, on the other hand, the Samaritans were baptized 'in the name of the Lord Jesus' and afterwards received the Holy Spirit when the apostles came and laid their hands on them. This last statement is probably an addition to make the story conform to the practice, prevalent when Acts was composed, of baptism being followed by the laying on of hands. Pneumatism had ceased; baptism and the laying on of hands were thought to confer the Holy Spirit as the Fourth Gospel shows. When Acts was composed it seems to have been thought that at first the apostles alone were capable of conferring the Holy Spirit and that, on that account, their function was not to administer baptism. This may be because, as their first task was to preach, they became associated with the occurrence of

pneumatism which would have been the immediate result of any fervent preaching of the word. Hence Paul can write, 'Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel.' (I Cor. I,17)

Apollos therefore brings to Ephesus the Judaistic Christianity which Alexandria had received from Jerusalem. On that account he accepts baptism as a rite of admission and invokes no name. On arriving at Corinth he challenges Paul's party on the count of baptizing in the name of Jesus. This would explain why Paul, after naming an Apollos faction at Corinth, says 'Were ye baptized in the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name.'

A priori it may be assumed that, as we find an Apollos faction and a Pauline faction existing at Corinth, a similar cleavage existed at Ephesus. In all probability the opposition to Paul was much stronger at Ephesus than at Corinth, because, at Ephesus, Paul was an intruder. The Ephesian church would, in origin and composition, be anti-pauline. It is more than likely that, as in Jerusalem, the Christians opposed to Paul joined with the Jews in attacking him, or, at least, deserted him in the face of such attacks. The reference in II Corinthians to a desperate situation at Ephesus, 'I almost despaired of Life' (II Cor. I,8) and to fighting with wild beasts there, indicate that Paul met, at Ephesus, more trials and conflicts than are narrated in Acts. The strength of the anti-pauline party is shown by Paul's warning to the elders who came to meet him at Miletus that 'after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.' (Acts XX,27,30)

There are definite signs that there was continuous contact between Alexandria and Ephesus. All the external evidence favors the thesis that the Fourth Gospel was composed in Ephesus. It will be remembered that Papias, as reported by Eusebius, says that he was told by the Elder that 'Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he could.' Streeter (The Four Gospels p. 19-21) considers that, by this statement, the Elder 'is anxious to

assert that the gospel of Matthew, which had only recently arrived at Ephesus, like that of Mark, is only deuter-apostolic, and, therefore, its authority cannot be quoted as final where it conflicts with the Fourth Gospel.' It is admitted that the points of contact between Matthew and John are very few: Streeter considers that the evidence that can be adduced to prove John's knowledge of Matthew is quite inconclusive (p. 415). He also inclines to think that John was aware of it but ignored it because it conflicted with his own assumptions. If, however, as Dr. Brandon suggests, Matthew's gospel was written in Alexandria, there seems no reason why the Fourth Gospel, or at any rate disconnected portions of it, should not have been written in Ephesus independently at the same time as Matthew's was being composed in Alexandria. Brandon's contention would tell against the suggestion which has been made in recent years that the Fourth Gospel was written in Alexandria and indirectly support the tradition that it was written in Ephesus. But if it be allowed that there existed such a close connection between the churches at Alexandria and Ephesus that the latter was in some respects a daughter of the former, the evidence brought to support the contention that the Fourth Gospel was written in Alexandria can be explained in a different way. One item of this evidence is that the Fourth Gospel was known in Alexandria by 135. The Rylands fragment of the Fourth Gospel is given this date, while more texts of John have been found in Egypt than of Mark or Luke, the number being 7 of John compared with 9 of Matthew (cf. C. H. Roberts, J.T.S., vol. I (1949), p. 164). There is also the strong Philonic flavor to be found in the prologue of the gospel. All this, however, only suggests that the Fourth Gospel was known in Alexandria at an early date and that the author knew of Philo's works. It might be further suggested that the author belonged to a church which had close connections with Alexandria, that he came from Alexandria to Ephesus acquainted with Philo's works and that, on the other hand, through this connection, his gospel became known in Alexandria at an early date. In the interval it would have been possible for Matthew's gospel to have appeared in Alexandria quite independently of the Fourth Gospel and, after the latter had been composed, to have become known in Ephesus.

Papias may well be anxious to assert that although Matthew originated in Alexandria, the mother church of Ephesus (containing perhaps the logia which had come from Jerusalem to Alexandria in Aramaic), its authority cannot be accepted as final.

This hypothesis is supported, rather than weakened, by the contents of the fragment of an unknown gospel discovered in Egypt belonging to the first half of the second century. (Idris Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*.) This fragment contains several passages which can be paralleled in the Fourth Gospel, one which can be paralleled in Matthew, Mark and Luke, but not in John, and one which can be paralleled in Matthew and Mark. The last consists of a quotation from the Old Testament and it is perhaps significant that the fragment and Matthew quote correctly from the Septuagint $\acute{o}$ $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$; while Mark gives $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{o}$ $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$; thus supporting the Alexandrine origin of the two former. It is also noticeable that, in the passages paralleled in Matthew and Mark, but not in John — the story of the healing of a leper — the parallel is closest between the fragment and Matthew if the number of words common to both are counted. There seems no reason to question the verdict of the editors of the fragment, Bell and Skeat, 'the fragment represents a source independent of those used by the synoptic gospels and that John either used the unknown gospel represented by the fragment or a source also used by the unknown gospel.' Not only does its discovery in Egypt suggest that it was written for the Christian community in Alexandria but, if Matthew was written in Alexandria, the parallels between it and Matthew seem to indicate that they belonged to the same *milieu*. They would appear to be the kind of trivial, unconscious assimilations which the author of Matthew might have made if he had purposely disregarded the unknown gospel in favor of Mark in order to create an equilibrium between the Judaistic Christianity of Alexandria and the Pauline gospel represented by Mark. On the other hand, if an Alexandrian Christian composed the fourth gospel in Ephesus, it is likely that he would have used, as one of his sources, a primitive gospel which he had known in Alexandria, especially if he wished to counter and correct the synoptic tradition founded

on Mark. The unknown gospel may well have been the source of the miracle at Cana (II, I,-19), that at Capernaum, and the Passion narrative.¹

Further support for the hypothesis suggested seems to come both from the sections in the Fourth Gospel devoted to John the Baptist and Matthew's account of Jesus' baptism. The references in the Fourth Gospel show plainly that they were composed in an environment where John and his baptism were ranged in opposition to the pre-eminence of Jesus and the conception of possession by the Holy Spirit being a necessary condition of admission into the church. The first reference (I,8) breaks the structure of the prologue in order to say, 'He was not that light but was sent to bear witness of the light.' If it be supposed that the prologue was a separate composition, it may well be that this insertion was made when it was added to the gospel. The Fourth Gospel does not say that Jesus was baptized by John, or even make any mention of real meeting or conversation between Jesus and John. 'The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith' (I,29). 'Again the next day after John stood and two of his disciples, and looking upon Jesus, as he walked, he saith, "behold, the Lamb of God."' And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.' (I,35-37) Thus, as Goguel says (Life of Jesus, p.271), 'the Fourth Gospel reduces the part of the Fore-runner to that of a testimony given to a personage whom he did not know in advance, who, at a given moment, was made known to him by the sign of the Spirit.'

Matthew's account of Jesus' baptism also suggests that it belongs to a *milieu* where it was necessary explicitly to assert the claims of Jesus over those of John. Matthew alone of the Synoptics gives an account of any conversation between John and Jesus in which John, as in the Fourth Gospel, testifies to the Messiahship of Jesus. 'John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to

¹ It is interesting to note that in place of the words *κῆρσον καίσαρι δδυναί* Mark XII, 13-17; the fragment has *βασιλεύειν [ἀπο]δοῦναι τὰ ἀνέκοντα τῇ ἀρχῇ*. The former is a transliteration of the Latin *censum Caesaris* while the latter is a verbal quotation of Maccabees from the Septuagint, I Maccabees X,20.

fulfil all righteousness' (Matt. III,14,15). This conversation seems to be recorded in answer to a contention that Jesus, by submitting to baptism at the hands of John, admitted the efficacy of John's baptism. Jesus' reply implies that by submitting himself to John's baptism he thereby enrolled himself among the servants of the kingdom, but did not accept it as a rite of spiritual purification. Thus at the very least from the references to John the Baptist in Matthew and the Fourth Gospel, compared with those in Mark and Luke, it may be inferred that they belonged to centres where there was much dispute about Jesus' relationship with John, i.e. Ephesus and Alexandria.

There remains the curious incident related in John III,22-IV,3 concerning a dispute between John's disciples and a Jew or Judaeon about purifying, i.e. about baptisms. The passage contains many inconsistencies and obscurities. John's disciples are offended because Jesus is successful, although John himself had proclaimed Jesus to be greater than he. It is said that Jesus baptizes (III,22) and that he does not baptize (IV,2). Jesus has more disciples than John (III,26-IV,1) but no one accepts him (III,32). Why should John's disciples dispute with a Jew about Jesus and why are we suddenly told that 'when therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John'? The Pharisees are here mentioned for the first time. Why are we told that John, when he was baptizing without let or hindrance, was not yet in prison? It can only be because, according to the Synoptic tradition, Jesus did not begin his ministry until after John was imprisoned. The author of the Fourth Gospel is using a source unknown to Mark, which seems to have told of John's ministry from the point of view of John and John's followers. It seems to have said that Jesus and John had a dispute about baptism as a rite of purification, that John disowned Jesus and that Jesus, on that account, left John. This version of the episode may have been put out by certain circles in Alexandria and Ephesus, so that the editor of the Fourth Gospel felt that, in the interests of unity, he could not ignore it, but changed its import to bring it into line with the synoptic tradition.

One further piece of internal evidence in both Matthew and the Fourth Gospel seems to show that both took their origin in

churches which were in close touch with each other, but had differing outlooks. That is the '*Tu es Petrus*' passage in Matthew XVI and the '*Pasce oves*' in John XXI. Apart from the '*Tu es Petrus*' statement, Peter is, in Matthew's gospel, described definitely as first of the apostles. Dr. Brandon considers that Matthew used the unrivalled claims of Peter who had been so closely connected with Alexandrian Christianity to combat the rising reputation of Paul; Goguel reckons that Peter is exalted to support the claims of the apostles against those of the *desposunoi*. If, however, Matthew is a product of Alexandrian Christianity, the exaltation of Peter would be unlikely to have been a polemic against the *desposunoi*, since it is improbable that dynastic Christianity could ever have been a force outside Jerusalem or after 70. Chapter XXI of the Fourth Gospel is considered to be an appendix to the gospel and seems to have been written partly as a commentary on the '*Tu es Petrus*' passage in Matthew. In the Fourth Gospel itself the beloved disciple is always given a superiority over Peter, but it may be noticed that the exaltation is not to Peter's detriment. It is always implied that Peter is foremost in practical ability, while the beloved disciple's excellence lies in mystic contemplation and spiritual understanding. Peter and he are made to stand for two different types of discipleship, but there is an implication that the beloved disciple's is the higher. In the '*Pasce oves*' passage, the writer seems to conform to the general tendency of the churches to give Peter a primacy over all the apostles which, it was thought, had been conferred on him by Jesus himself. This may well have been judged necessary in Ephesus when the church there became acquainted with Matthew's gospel. Peter's primacy could not be denied as universally he was believed to be the mouthpiece of the apostles. But John makes out that the primacy was not conferred explicitly by the historic Jesus, but after the resurrection by the risen Christ. It is not legislative, but spiritual and pastoral, the command being 'feed my sheep.'

All the references to Ephesus in the New Testament seem to indicate that the church there was severely rent by factions. If they are not direct they are indirect by their insistent plea for unity. In Acts we have Paul's speech to the elders from Ephesus

at Miletus predicting, 'Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw disciples after them' (Acts XX,30). Unity is one of the recurrent themes of the Fourth Gospel. 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold' (is there here a reference to the church at Alexandria?) 'them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one flock and one shepherd' (John X,16). 'By this shall men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another' (XIII,30). 'These things I command you, that ye love one another' (XV,17). 'Neither pray I for them alone but for them also which shall believe through their word, that they all may be one' (XVII,23). One of the themes of the epistle to the Ephesians, which may at any rate be assumed to be addressed to a church which was affected by the situation at Ephesus, if not to the Ephesian church itself, is the unity of the church as the body of Christ (IV,3 ff.) and the union of the church with Christ's glorious church not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (V,27).

Schweitzer stated that the real problem of Christian origins is to bridge the gap between the career of Jesus and the faith of the Jerusalemite Christians on the one hand and the doctrine of Paul and Hellenic Christianity on the other. The evidence here submitted seems to suggest that Ephesus was the creative crucible in which these two diverse forms of primitive Christianity were commingled in sharp conflict from which emerged the Fourth Gospel containing all the essentials of primitive Catholicism. Palestinian Christianity came to Ephesus via Alexandria and was already there when Paul first visited Ephesus. Because it rested its claims on its derivation from the historical Jesus, the Fourth Gospel is in form a gospel, and not a dialogue or an epistle or merely a collection of discourses. It goes so far as to correct Mark on certain facts and details because Mark was the standard gospel. On the other hand it hellenizes not so much Paul's doctrine as many of the features of Paulinism. But it also gives to early Catholicism one thing which was neither Pauline nor Palestinian, i.e. the conception of the new religion as a mystery known only to those who had been initiated and a means of grace constituted in the sacraments. It is sometimes argued that this element came from the mystery religions or the gnostic sects. But the

fact that the Christianity of the Fourth Gospel shares this element with them does not mean that it was borrowed from them, but that, with them, it had lost all sense of urgency because it had spiritualized the primitive Christian eschatology. It was not in Ephesus, but in Rome, that Catholicism became a religion not only consoling, but conquering, for the Roman had the will to conquer and organize, as well as the desire for consolation and hope.

PORTRAIT OF A DEVOUT HUMANIST
M. L'ABBÉ HENRI BRÉMOND

AN ESSAY INTRODUCTORY TO HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT

BY

ALASTAIR GUINAN

BROADLY speaking, there are discernible in the several manifestations of Christianity — one is almost tempted to say, of all religion — two general attitudes. These attitudes of movement or inclination have very well been termed the *horizontal* and the *vertical*.

According to the latter of these, man's spirit is insistently urged upwards to God — as some would prefer to put it, to the Absolute — and away from human and temporal ties: the end of religion is thus held to be the trampling under of all that is of earth. It is an attitude summed up in a restrictive interpretation of the words *terrena despiciere*, found in many Latin liturgical collects. In Catholic Christianity this *vertical* tendency is fairly considered to have been given its most noteworthy exemplification, as it has had its most impassioned exponents, among monastic figures; but in Protestant circles those who have been identified with the cast of thought termed Calvinistic have been no less unrelenting in their disregard of the gentler and more humane aspects of religious expression. Yet a personality more generally appealing than that of either a typical monk or an authentic follower of the founder of the Genevan theocracy is often invoked as the patron of the *vertical* tendency when the great Saint Augustine himself is quoted as the author of the wish to know nothing but God and the soul because in knowing them he would gain nothing by knowing aught besides.

Whether or not the fatherhood of the more austere doctrine may, in consequence of this dictum, be justly imputed to the incomparable *Vindex gratiae*, — for his words also bear a generous interpretation — the doctrine itself has exerted a lasting, if some-

what imponderable, influence upon Christian thought, especially as that has been expressed by those, Protestant and Catholic alike, who have claimed to represent some facet of what theologians call Augustinianism.

Side by side with this *vertical* and exclusivist tendency, there has perdured a more genial attitude toward the matter. This attitude — the *horizontal* tendency which, as a matter of fact, pre-supposes the co-existence of the core of the *vertical* movement, i.e., the rise of the spirit God-ward — this attitude seeks to include within its orbit as much as may possibly be comprehended in the spiritual life of man. Its aims, determined by a deep understanding of the nature of the being who is *part mortal clay and part ethereal fire*,¹ — its aims endeavor to encompass and to sanctify all aspects of human existence as carrying within them some portents or prophecies of divinity. It interprets the *terrena despicere* of the collects as “to look down upon” rather than “to despise”; that is to say, to look down upon in the sense of one who sees objects as from a vantage point, and in the relative proportion they bear to each other. It so seeks to bring to the service of God and to the development of man all that God has made and has made man capable of using.

In the spirit of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, the proponent of the *horizontal* tendency would accept Augustine's desire to know God as an admission of the necessity of first knowing man. For it seems that, given the limitations of human nature, it is only through knowledge of man and other creatures that we can aspire to even that remote cognition of God, whereby he is known not indeed in essence but in manifestation, which is all that is possible to finite beings in respect to Being Infinite.

This is Christian Humanism; and it has been well declared by Edward Ingram Watkin,² that St. Paul wrote its charter in the words:

“ . . . all that rings true, all that commands reverence, and all that makes for right; all that is pure, all that is lovely, all that is gracious

¹ Richard West: “Ad amicos.” West (1716-42), who was the grandson of Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, was an intimate friend of the poet Gray to whom he was familiarly known as Favonius. The text of this poem is published from Gray's Common Place Books at Pembroke, I, 91, in Duncan C. Tovey: Gray and his friends (Cambridge University Press, 1890), pp. 95-8.

² E. I. Watkin: Catholic Art and Culture (New York, Sheed & Ward, 1945), p. 6.

in the telling; virtue and merit, wherever virtue and merit are found — let this be the argument of your thoughts.”³

I

Pre-eminent among modern interpreters and exponents of the humane view of life and of the function of religion within that life was the Abbé Henri Brémond. He died in 1933 with the reputation of having been a priest of great and liberal learning and an author of rich productivity. Yet, primarily, it is as he was wont to describe himself that he is best remembered — as a *devout humanist*.

There are some of the less thoughtful among the devout who appear to think the conjunction which this description implies an inadmissible one. They are heard to speak disparagingly of *humanism*, and they re-act to those who characterize themselves as *humanists* as though they had professed to be mere humanitarians. To such men the word *humanism* conveys a concern with man only as a creature of time and story; it has, in their minds, no connotation linking it with that aspect which identifies man as touched by the means of grace and the hope of glory, apt for an eternal destiny. If to any such, a priest be described as a *devout humanist*, they are quick to conclude that a mistake has been made, or to suggest that the good man in question is far from being as trustworthy a spiritual guide as his admirers imagine. They will go so far as to hint that it is only a matter of time until the unveiling of his failings by an ever vigilant authority will make apparent to all his inadequacy.

Of course, in respect to our day, these captious critics are representatives of the type of mind displayed by Msgr. Umberto Benigni while he was pursuing the activities so wittily described in Miss Maisie Ward's study of the latter part of the career of her father, Wilfrid Ward.⁴ In a deeper sense, such zealots, as well as being *institutionalists* in the pejorative sense of that term, are the victims of their own attempt to over-spiritualize the hu-

³ Philippians, 4; 8, in the translation of Monsignor Ronald Arbuthnott Knox.

⁴ M. Ward: *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition*; [II: *Insurrection versus Resurrection*] (New York, Sheed & Ward, 1934-7), pp. 303 *sq.*

mane element in religion. Were they to pursue their theory to its logical conclusion, (which we may thankfully note they rarely do), they would make an end by the open expression of dissatisfaction with the nature of man as God has constituted him; they would, in a word, become Manicheans.

On the other hand, an exponent, like Abbé Brémond, of a comprehensive view of the nature of man has an especial claim upon the interest of the philosophically minded: it is in the setting forth of this view of man's nature that scholastic psychology is so far superior to other attempts to explain a vexed question. For, leaving aside the aberration of those who see in the body only the *prison house* of the mind or soul, and also turning away from those who reduce the mind to the status of a mere appendage to the body or a subordinate aspect of the body's activity, the psychology of the schools, with its *organic* conception of man, offers a reasonable account of his nature in that it seems to recognize the observable data and to reconcile the apparent contradictions between our knowledge of human nature, as we see it in ourselves and in others, with varied attempts which have been made to explain the conjunction of the bodily and mental faculties which make up man.⁵

This organic conception sees the physical and intellectual elements in man as constituting a substantial union. Two substances are combined to form him. He is therefore not entirely a creature of physical nature, nor wholly an intellectual being: he attains such perfection of form as he has by the union of these two principles and by their harmonious functioning. This concept has the advantage of being complete — it deals with the whole man.

The devout humanism whereof M. Brémond was the most distinguished modern exponent is actually an expression in literary terms of the concepts which scholastic psychology, following Aristotle, presents to us in the stylized language of formal philosophy. This is all the more striking because M. Brémond, like Cardinal Newman, was somewhat impatient of — or, at least, chose to ignore — the shibboleths of neo-scholasticism, avoiding just those

⁵ Cf. Robert Edward Brennan, o.p.: *History of Psychology from the standpoint of a Thomist* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945), esp. chapter 8, "The Thomistic synthesis"; pp. 61-79.

aspects of the system which are, as a rule, almost the only things about it which its superficial admirers seem to value.

There is, moreover, in addition to this underlying characteristic, another interesting aspect of the work of the Abbé Brémond. A classic summation of the priestly calling, whether it be general or specific, exists in the words, *Contemplari, et aliis contemplata tradere*.⁶ How appropriate is this motto in relation to the life-work of a priest who spent his time delving into the record of that spiritual legacy which Catholic France has bequeathed to the world, and who then distilled this message for the modern reader.

The canvas which the Abbé Brémond spreads before us in his *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux* is the result of his contemplation of the work wrought by the Finger of God in the souls and through the writings of scores of men and women during the centuries following the Reformation: Brémond's great book reflects his inerrant determination to set down the refined product of analytic meditation upon whatsoever in that record he found lovely, fair, true, and of good report.

The family tradition from which Marie-Joseph-François-Régis-Ignace-Henri Brémond sprang in 1865 was one of singular diverse-ness: his paternal forbears were deeply devoted to the hereditary religious spirit fostered in France by the elder branch of the Royal House of Bourbon, while on his maternal side his ancestry included one who is said to have been a disciple of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. It may be, perhaps, to this colorful amalgam of apparent opposites that the future historian of French religious thought owed at least some measure of that acute but generous perception which he so developed that he was able to appreciate at their proper worth what might have seemed to a less sensitive student

⁶ Père Mandonnet refers to this phrase as "la définition de la vocation dominicaine donnée par Thomas d'Aquin." Cf. Pierre Mandonnet, o.p.: *Saint Dominique; l'idée, l'homme, et l'oeuvre*; ed. par. M. H. Vicaire (Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, [1938]), I; 220. The words themselves may be found in St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica*, 2a 2ae, q.188, a.6. Despite what restrictions may be imagined to attach to the phrase by reason of its provenance, the thought is not readily robbed of a wider application than it may customarily be given in Dominican circles; nor would we, for that matter, have any right to assume that the Dominicans themselves, although appropriating it as the distinctive expression of what is generally recognized as the characteristic *note* of their Order, would deny the pertinency of the maxim to those outside their fellowship who combine devotion to religion and scholarship with the desire to spread both abroad.

facets of truth too disparate ever to be reconciled or given their appropriate weight within a broad frame of knowledge.

He early manifested a taste for letters, being encouraged by his first preceptors both in that wide reading which is normally the foundation of all truly deep learning, and in those early essays at self-expression which betray unmistakable signs of originality of thought by the individualistic and often unexpected choice of models.

His spiritual development kept pace with, or rather gave the pace to, his intellectual growth. Thus he is found, at the age of seventeen, as a candidate for admission to the Society of Jesus. His early days in that Society were passed in one of the colleges which the French Province then maintained in Britain. Here he took advantage of the opportunity to apprehend something of the distinctively English spirit whose tone he was to catch so well, and whose able interpreter he afterwards became to many French students. Expressive of his breadth of mind as well as of the wise tolerance characteristic of those who had the direction of his education, is the fact that much of his holiday time was spent with a British Protestant family. Such contact did not fail to have its effect upon one otherwise surrounded by the orthodox atmosphere commonly and correctly thought to be the distinctive note of Jesuitism. It appears, however, that the Society displayed at that period a tendency the opposite to what the historian of ecclesiastical education must often deplore as a policy of isolationism from all currents of opinion other than those favored within a narrow *milieu*.

On Henri Brémond's return to France he was assigned to the teaching of the Humanities at the Collège de St. Étienne near Lyon. He there gave evidence of that innate ability he possessed as an arouser of the generous enthusiasm of the young. He again crossed the Channel, going to the College of Mold, in Wales, for his own final studies in the theological sciences, and in 1892 he was ordained to the priesthood.

These English associations left a profound impress upon Brémond; they are generally held to be responsible for his remarkable perceptiveness in the treatment of English themes. His works upon Cardinal John Henry Newman have passed into the

standard literature of the subject. However much certain of his conclusions may provoke discussion, even disagreement, among specialists, his writings on the great Oratorian remain among the indispensable adjuncts of those who would make the rewarding attempt to plumb the mind of the English Cardinal. It is by consideration of such a book as his *Newman: essai de biographie psychologique*,⁷ that students may hope to understand more fully the Cardinal's mission in the nineteenth century and his message in a larger sense.

M. Brémond wrote, too, with an unusual degree of understanding of aspects of English life other than that represented by Newman. Not only studies of other Tractarian figures but vivid delineations of representatives of the Broad Church school, and even of British Non-Conformists, are found in his work. Yet it is evident that for all his realization of the enrichment of religious thought effected by such men as Wesley, the Cairds, A. M. Fairbairn, and James Martineau, his sympathy with the English spirit lay rather with its characteristically Anglican manifestation. In this recognition of a certain admirable tone in the life and tradition of the Establishment, M. Brémond was the true heir of French prelates of the *ancien régime* who exhibited a like spirit of comprehension. It was during this period of his life that the young Jesuit contributed to the Society's chief literary organ in France, the monthly review *Études*, so many of these penetrating essays which were later incorporated into the book *L'Inquiétude religieuse*, studies of religious unrest and conversion in a varied group of individuals.

In 1900 the Jesuits sent him to Athens to fulfill a preaching engagement. Here there took place what Abbé Dimnet calls "a meeting of considerable significance";⁸ for in the ancient seat of Hellenic culture were forged the links of friendship which, ever after, united Maurice Barrès and Henri Brémond. For years they remained close friends, exercising a large influence one upon the other, in a literary and personal association broken only by death.

The year 1904 marked a term in M. Brémond's career. It was

⁷ (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1906). The English translation by H. C. Corrance is called *The Mystery of Newman* (London, Williams and Norgate, 1907).

⁸ In a personal letter to the present writer; E. D. to A. G.; 18 October, 1952.

at this time that, with the consent of the authorities of the Society, he withdrew from the ranks of the Jesuits. Henceforth his canonical position was that of a priest of the diocese of Aix-en-Provence, with whose Ordinaries he seems to have enjoyed a noteworthy degree of cordial understanding. Brémond was fortunate to be in possession of personal resources which made it unnecessary for him to seek merely diocesan employment, and, in accordance with the norm set in this matter by the Canon Law, the successive Archbishops of Aix under whose jurisdiction he was, were thus enabled to consent to a certain amount of freedom and independence in the Abbé's desire to follow his chosen bent in study and in its literary expression.

The period which followed during the next few years was one of much agitation in the ecclesiastical dovecots of England and the Continent. From this fluttering not even the North American Church was completely sundered, despite the emphasis then given in these regions to the hundred breathless occupations of a work-a-day, school-building, mission-giving, organization-developing type of Catholicism. It was the tense era of the movement called *Modernism*, and many of the friends of M. Brémond had figured in activities eventually to be condemned by Pope Pius X.

Another former Jesuit (whose exit from the Society was made in a manner unlike M. Brémond's peaceful withdrawal), the Anglo-Irish writer Fr. George Tyrrell, had been a notably articulate protagonist of an endeavor hopefully embarked upon as a means of accommodating the abiding truth of religious faith to the needs of the time, but which had unhappily led to the point where that truth seemed, according to the view of those in supreme authority in the Church, about to be so compromised as to be threatened in just those aspects of its nature which authority deemed it of vital importance to preserve.

The death of Fr. Tyrrell was the occasion of a brief conflict — misunderstanding would be a better word — with ecclesiastical authority, in which the Abbé Brémond figured rather passively.

The pathetically touching account of the last days of the excommunicated Tyrrell, who about a month before had remarked, "I am glad God is to judge me, and not any of his servants," has been given by an eye-witness, Fr. Tyrrell's devoted disciple,

Maude Domenica Mary Petre,⁹ at whose home he died; and as literature that chapter in the history of Modernism is not likely to be surpassed.

Brémond was summoned by telegram on 12 July 1909 to Storrington in Surrey, where he found on his arrival at Miss Petre's property, Mulberry House, that Tyrrell, although able to give some indication of joyful recognition of his friend, was paralyzed and totally deaf. He had already been given conditional absolution after having confessed to Fr. Dessoulavy, and later had received Extreme Unction at the hands of the Prior of Storrington, Fr. Xavier de la Fourvière; and M. Brémond, thinking he might reasonably presume the desire of the dying man as he judged it from the signs the speechless Tyrrell was able to make, vested in surplice and stole and administered the usual absolution *in extremis*. The Eucharist had not been administered because Fr. de la Fourvière had judged the sick man to be physically incapable of actually *swallowing* the sacred Elements, as is required for validity of the Sacrament.

When Fr. Tyrrell died on the 15th, the little group of his faithful friends who were with him felt that in virtue of the rites which had been carried out they might properly request for him the ceremonies of the Catholic burial service, although he had not, owing to his speechless condition, been asked to make the retractive statement customarily demanded, according to the dictates of Canon Law, of those who are dying under sentence of excommunication.

The Ordinary of the diocese in which Storrington lay, Monsignor Peter Amigo, Bishop of Southwark, took another view of the matter: he refused the request, thus forbidding the cherished formalities which grace the burial of a Roman Catholic. This meant that the body might not be brought into the Church for Mass, that the

⁹ Miss Petre (1863-1942), was the grand-daughter of the thirteenth Lord Petre and, through her mother, a grand-daughter of the Earl of Wicklow. She was at one time a member of a religious sisterhood of French foundation, the Daughters of Mary, and she rose to be Superioress of the English and Irish Province prior to her withdrawal, an event which took place after the turn of the century. To Fr. Tyrrell she showed herself, in the words of James A. Walker (in the Hibbert Journal of July 1943), "hard as a diamond and more tender than a mother." She edited his Autobiography and Letters, and herself wrote many books and articles dealing with religious and philosophical themes. Her last work was the study of the Abbé Loisy to which reference is made below; see note 15, *infra*.

rite of burial with its beautiful and consoling prayers officially invoking the suffrages of the whole Church might not be carried out, and that interment might not even be made in the consecrated ground of the Catholic cemetery.

Although in such a case it is the undoubted prerogative of the bishop of the place to determine the issue, it has seemed to some that the actual decision of Dr. Amigo was unduly harsh. On the other hand, commentators have not been wanting who have defended that decision on the ground that it would be idle to invoke sanctions or to decree penalties for such ecclesiastical offences as Fr. Tyrrell had been charged with and then incontinently to remove them in the event of death. Yet all shades of opinion may readily merge in the admission that the situation had been unhappily complicated by a letter which Miss Petre addressed on 15 July 1909, to the Times and the Daily Mail, and which was published by these newspapers on the day following. The letter emphasized the sentiments of the Baron v. Hügel who, as Miss Petre stated, "perfectly knew the general line of thought . . . of the sick man." It was here set forth in what M. Loisy, with his customary acuity, calls the *characteristically arithmetical manner* of the Baron that 1stly., Fr. Tyrrell would wish to receive the Sacraments; 2ndly., he would be contrite in respect to any and all sins; but 3rdly., he would not wish to receive the Sacraments as the price of a retraction of what he believed to be the truth.¹⁰

This statement could be interpreted as a forthright and quite orthodox declaration of the rights of conscience which, as all reputable Catholic moralists hold, are of paramount importance in respect to the decision of any individual who is called upon to make a specific choice. Yet, in the frame of reference into which it was fitted at the time, its terminology was not calculated to win the heart, so to speak, of Msgr. Amigo, and there does seem reason to think that, whether because of this letter or for other cause, the Bishop of Southwark may have failed sufficiently to explore aspects of Fr. Tyrrell's case which would have justified a more favorable and indulgent attitude than he actually took.

A benevolent attitude in the matter could legitimately have

¹⁰ Cf. the text of this letter as given in the Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell; ed. by M. D. Petre (London, Edward Arnold, 1912), II; 434-5.

found its basis in what might have been judged to be Fr. Tyrrell's wishes and dispositions at the actual time of his death. It is known, too, that he had remarked to Miss Petre on the occasion of the visit of his friend Fr. Dessoulavy, "He won't let me die without the sacraments."¹¹ From this statement alone — apart even from Tyrrell's life-long concern with institutional religion and his well-known disposition to cherish all sacramental ordinances — may his desire have been inferred without any difficulty. And there is certainly good theological ground for the thought that it were better to err by excess in ministration where desire for it is even doubtful, than to fail to offer it when it is wanted.

To tell the truth, the laws of the Church in these affairs and in such junctures are as rigid and unyielding or as broad and gentle as is the mind of the interpreter. It is so that some ill-instructed priests have refused to say Mass or to offer prayers for *lapsed* Catholics or for those who never were known as Catholics. Such men apparently forget that the prohibition of offering and prayer has respect only to *public* and *announced* suffrages, and that there is no objection in law, as there can be none in logic, to the Mass being privately said in such cases. Of course, in the Tyrrell incident this aspect of the argument need not be stressed; having been absolved prior to his death Fr. Tyrrell can scarcely be maintained to have died outside the Church's communion.¹²

¹¹ Cf. the Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell; II; 429. Miss Petre, no doubt from prudential reasons perfectly understandable in view of the atmosphere at the time of the publication of that work, refers to this priest of the diocese of Southwark only as Fr. D., and pointedly remarks that he will not be more explicitly named. M. Loisy, however, writing a quarter of a century after the event, leaves us in no doubt of his identity; cf. A. F. Loisy: *George Tyrrell et Henri Brémond* (Paris, E. Nourry, 1936), p. 15.

¹² I am aware that M. Loisy, nonetheless, appears to think otherwise. He says, in fact,

"... George Tyrrell . . . qui avait bien pu être nanti des derniers sacrements, mais qui n'en était pas moins mort dans l'excommunication, sans avoir fait amende honorable à l'Eglise romaine, qu'il avait grièvement offensée dans ses derniers écrits." — A. F. Loisy: *op. cit.*; pp. v-vi.

However, the Abbé Loisy seems here to set his feet firmly upon a path which, logically followed, leads to a position similar to that taken in our own day by the Revd. Leonard Feeney, a position which is also that of those who uphold *the stiff Anglican doctrine of Apostolic succession*, who, as Dean Inge mordantly notes,

"divide all Christendom into those who unchurch them and those whom they unchurch." — William Ralph Inge: *Vale* (London, Longmans, Green, 1934), p. 17.

The appearance in print of Miss Petre's letter became the excuse for insistence by the Bishop of Southwark that it be established that Fr. Tyrrell had made a positive retraction before his death, and the existence of the retraction was made a requirement for the granting of the burial rites. In vain did M. Brémond protest that no priest in the world, as he put it, would have asked a penitent in such physical condition as was Tyrrell, for a retraction, and that such a request would, in any event, have been useless in view of Tyrrell's inability to respond. In vain did Miss Petre declare that she and not Fr. Tyrrell had written the letter which was made the basis of the decision. Emphasis was concentrated upon the point of the retraction: other considerations appear to have been ignored.

So it was that, despite whatever arguments might be advanced in favor of a milder judgment, under the chosen aspect of consideration it was Msgr. Amigo's interpretation of the law that necessarily prevailed. He was the ultimate exponent of ecclesiastical authority within the diocese of Southwark, and Tyrrell's friends, perforce, accepted his decision. It was in accordance with it, therefore, that on 21 July 1909, Fr. Tyrrell was laid to rest in a place offered in the Church of England cemetery close by Storrington Priory, and purchased by Miss Petre and Fr. Tyrrell's relative, Lord Tyrrell. It was in accordance, too, with the episcopal decision, that the Abbé Brémond refrained from the use of any priestly vestment which would indicate the intention to act otherwise than in his private capacity when he read the prayers from the exequial office and delivered a touching tribute to his friend, at the grave:

"You see the place we have lovingly chosen for him since another place was refused to us. You see the place. He used to like it, and many a time, when he was living in the Priory, here he came, reciting his breviary in the very same path beside which they have dug his grave. As you see, it stands half-way between the two Churches, the one in which he died and the other in which he was born. On this side, separated from us by a tiny wall, the Catholic Church; on the other, the Church of Keble, of his friend of friends, Dolling, and of so many of you who have been so discreetly kind and so courageously true to him. You would have kept faithful to him in spite of all intellectual discrepancies, had they been much greater than in fact they were. Still,

you know how deep was his reverence for the old Establishment through which not only Newman, but Manning himself testified that the Holy Ghost had been and was still working for the greater benefit of England.

"When I speak of this, his reverence, I feel I do not say enough. He loved it too, not only as the home of so many of his friends, not only as the home of some of the millions for whom he ever cared so much, but also as the home which seemed to await him, promising to this wandering and exiled pilgrim of eternity, with some of the sacramental ordinances which were for him of so great value, the strength of a religious brotherhood and a sense of rest. So it was, and we need not try to conceal it, being twice bound to tell the plain and entire truth in speaking of him who feared nothing in this world, except the faintest shadow of a lie. . .

"He wanted a Church, both from the sense of the necessity of a social organization of the Christian idea, and still more, perhaps, from his profound belief in, and his intense love for, the sacramental side of religion. No dogma was dearer to his heart than the dogma of the communion of Saints of which I confidently repeated to his dying ears the sweet, short, and simple formula: *Credo in communionem sanctorum*. Of his sacramental aspirations we have a touching proof in the paper dated January 1st 1909, in which he states his wishes about his own funeral. There he says that he wished nothing to be written on his grave, except his name and the fact that he was a Catholic priest, to which was to be added the emblem of the Chalice and the Host — of which we have his own rough sketch.

"The spell which the Anglican Church exercised over him during his last years was much more than the ordinary sweetness of the recollections of childhood. Both his heart and mind, both his intellectual and devotional aspirations, inclined him towards a Church; and so it came to pass that, while the leader of the Tractarian movement deeply felt the fascination of the Roman Church, this greatest of later Catholic leaders in England felt the fascination of a Church which was no more his own. But he did not yield to the spell; and this is the hard-won victory of his faith, the splendid and long-significant testimony which both his writings and his interior life render to the Church of Rome. Bear with me, dear unknown friends, who loved him so well: we, his confidants of every hour . . . we knew the pathetic struggle which seemed, at times, to absorb his activities, and we knew, too, without the slightest hesitation, what would be the end of that struggle. We knew that, for him, the Roman Catholic Church, as a fact, stood for the oldest and the widest body of corporate Christian experience, for the closest approximation, so far attained, to the still far distant ideal of a

Catholic Church. Long before he had written it, with his mastery and pregnant command of the English tongue, we knew that the very word "Catholic" was music to *his* ears, and summoned before *his* eyes the outstretched all-embracing arms of Him who died for the *orbis terrarum*.

"These last words of his seem to me to describe exactly what was his position towards Catholicism . . .

'it is impossible to deny that the revelation of the Catholic religion and that of Jesus are the same, not only in substance, but largely in form. . . It was in the form of such a tradition that he necessarily embodied his Gospel, and the Catholic Church has preserved the earthen vessel with its heavenly treasure, while those who have broken and cast away the vessel seem to have lost most of the treasure. Ought we not still to keep it, while carefully distinguishing it from its contests?'

"Before leaving him, will you allow me to address him a last farewell in the name of his many French, Italian, and German friends, saying which, I mean, indeed, the learned ones who had found comfort in his writings and who were devoted to him, although they might not have agreed with all he said, but I also mean, and quite as much, the simple people whom he knew when living with me in Provence or in Brittany, and who loved him at once. . .

"As for our personal loss, it is beyond words. He was the one to whom we turned in all our anxieties, and to whom some of us, at least, owe it that they kept faithful to the Church and to Christ. To realise that we shall never hear him again on earth would entirely darken our lives, if he had not taught us his own bitter but triumphant optimism; and the present duty of hoping against hope. Hope! This must be our parting word and feeling, and I feel sure he would have liked me to end these few farewell words by the lines of the Christian poet he loved so much:

"Prisoner of hope thou art — look up and sing
In hope of promised spring;
As in the pit his father's darling lay
Beside the desert way;
And knew not how, but knew his God would save
Even from the living grave;
So buried with our Lord, we close our eyes
To the decaying world, till angels bid us rise.'"¹³

¹³ The full text is in the Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell; II; pp. 443.

Notwithstanding the clearly-indicated private character of M. Brémont's acts and words, Msgr. Amigo concluded that his mandate had been disobeyed; and three days later, on 24 July, with what must be called over-precipitate haste, he despatched to the Prior of Storrington, by telegraph, the bald message: "Do not allow Brémont to say Mass."

There does not readily leap to mind thought of any earthly authority competent to prohibit private prayer, or which could justly attempt to penalize Brémont for the rôle he took in the burial of his friend. It has been said that the *penalty*, at least as originally inflicted, was a light one — prohibition to say Mass in a diocese which the Abbé was visiting and was soon to leave. Yet, whatever be thought of it, one wonders at its necessity. The Bishop had achieved what one is entitled to presume he must have wanted: he had prevented a public funeral, and he had effectively ensured that the burial of Fr. Tyrrell would not be in the Catholic cemetery. Having accomplished this much, it is strange that he was not content to drop the matter. Instead, he proceeded further: he wished to 'punish' the friend of the dead man who had said prayers at the grave-side while carefully indicating that he was acting as a private Christian rather than as a minister of the Church. This private aspect was certainly emphasized by the fact that Brémont did not wear priestly vestments, and by his omission from the prayers he said of words which seem to require the sacerdotal character, words which, as Miss Petre thought, could not fitly be said, no priest being *officially* present.

It would be difficult, it seems, to maintain that Msgr. Amigo's display of his power rested on any reasonable basis. It nevertheless constituted an inhibition laid upon the Abbé, and it was not until he had published a letter in which he disclaimed any inten-

sqq. For gracious permission to make so extensive an extract I am indebted to the publishers, Messrs. Edward Arnold of London, and to Miss Petre's executor, James A. Walker, Esq., of Cardiff, Wales. Mr. Walker (in a letter to me dated 17 May 1953), remarks, "I must be nearly the last survivor of those who heard his [H. B.'s] unforgettable tribute to George Tyrrell at the funeral in 1909. It is one of my most treasured memories, unfading while life is slowly ebbing away." And M. Loisy calls this address "le plus beau discours qu'il ait fait de sa vie"; while it is impossible to overlook the satisfaction with which he goes on to observe: "Ajoutons que le plus féroce des théologiens du Saint-Office n'y aurait pas pu trouver un mot a reprendre." — A. F. Loisy: op. cit.; p. 27.

tion of acting in a reprehensible manner that the Southwark prohibition was annulled by the Roman authorities. The Archbishop of Aix-en-Provence, Monseigneur Bonnefoy, showed no disposition to agree with the Bishop of Southwark. So far from disapproving of Brémond's conduct, the Archbishop said of him that he was "innocent comme l'enfant qui vient de naître."¹⁴ Are we entitled to believe that this good opinion which his own Ordinary had of a priest so summarily suspended by another bishop carried some weight with Cardinal Merry del Val, the all-powerful Secretary of State to Pope Pius X? In any event, the censure was lifted by Rome, and the Abbé found himself completely restored to the exercise of the priestly function in November of the same year.

Miss Petre was destined to be less fortunate. The same Bishop of Southwark whose over-zealous stringency had placed M. Brémond in a position of such embarrassment, demanded that Miss Petre take the anti-Modernist oath which is exacted of the clergy in order to make certain their adhesion to the decrees promulgated by Pius X concerning the heretical tendencies he desired to extirpate. The lady asked that she first be given a positive statement, from some authoritative source, about the infallible force of the decrees to which she was asked so formally to declare her assent. When this elucidation was denied her, she declined to take the oath. The Bishop, persisting in his Eumenidean pursuit of reputed Modernists, then declared that she would not be permitted to receive any sacraments in his diocese. Apparently, however, she found no difficulty, during the next thirty years, in receiving them elsewhere, a fact which of itself indicates that not all bishops think alike in these matters. At Miss Petre's death in 1942 at the age of eighty, there was a bizarre echo of the events of 1909: a funeral Mass was said in due form for her at the Assumption Convent, Kensington Square, London; but as her burial took place in the diocese of Southwark, no priest was permitted to offer prayer at her grave.¹⁵

¹⁴ So M. Brémond himself quoted the Archbishop, in a letter to M. Loisy. Cf. A. F. Loisy: *op. cit.*; p. 35.

¹⁵ Cf. the introductory memoir, by James A. Walker (the literary executor of Miss Petre and of Fr. Tyrrell), in *M. D. Petre: Alfred Loisy; his religious significance* (Cambridge University Press, 1944), p. x. This memoir is an abridgement of Mr. Walker's interesting essay in the *Hibbert Journal*, 41 (July 1943), pp. 340-6.

It was in the year following the Tyrrell affair that M. Brémond published his *Apologie pour Fénelon*, and it is not surprising if we discern in that noble defence of a misunderstood man a tendency to disparage the limitations of the official mind as represented by Bossuet. The Bishop of Meaux is an outstanding figure in the history of the French Church, and a man possessed, moreover, of real genius; yet in some degree he shared with Peter Amigo the temperament of one who sees in those who are in disagreement with him only a *garden enclosed*, to which he has lost the key. Brémond's raillery of Bossuet is gentle, although not less telling for that. He gives due weight to the consideration that Bossuet is generally held to have been vindicated in respect to the doctrinal part of the dispute; but he does not conceal the deplorable fact that in his handling of personalities *l'aigle de Meaux* was often curiously maladroit. Years later, in his edition of Père de Causade's Bossuet, maître d'oraison, Brémond was to show that even the doctrinal differences between Bossuet and Fénelon are often exaggerated by those whose knowledge of the question at issue is really superficial.

When the charming, if — as it may be — not entirely judicious, study of Ste. Chantal appeared in 1912, certain persons, still resenting the Tyrrell incident and perhaps, too, seeking revenge for what they thought to be disrespect for the great Bossuet in the *Apologie pour Fénelon*, succeeded in prevailing upon the Roman Congregation of the Index to proscribe the lively account of la Baronne de Chantal, the first Superioress of the Visitandines. There is ground for thinking that, at that particular time, this cannot have been a very difficult end to attain in respect of almost any book of unusual and distinctive character;¹⁶ and, in fact, the work was placed on the list of those volumes which are regarded as being not entirely suitable reading for all Catholics indiscriminately. In connection with this act there took place rather scurrilous attacks upon the book and its author in some narrow sections of the religious press; but M. Brémond apparently did not allow this activity — so like the agitated movement of gnats — to

¹⁶ Maisie Ward cites Jacques Rivière as saying that "the Index at this period grew with great rapidity, the number of titles added from 1907 to 1914 being twice that of 1900 to 1907." — Cf. M. Ward: *op. cit.*; II; 309.

disturb him. May it not have been his just estimate of the real weight of such attacks which moved him to send a copy of Sainte Chantal to his friend, Abbé Alfred Loisy, with the suggestive inscription: "I, vitande, ad vitandum. Hommage cordial de l'auteur"? ¹⁷

Indeed, in trying or adverse circumstances, the Abbé Brémond bore himself *en vrai philosophe* and with a pleasing touch of humor. In reply to a query about his feelings at the time Ste. Chantal was placed upon the Index, he gently remarked that those who enjoy the advantages of being Catholics must put up with the inconveniences.¹⁸ Nor would there seem any reason to doubt that he shared the witty opinion of another friend, Canon Ernest Dimnet, who with characteristic penetration gave us what is at once the best definition and the most satisfactory explanation of a much misunderstood apparatus in the economy of the Roman Church when he pointed out that the Index is, in effect, a device which enables the learned to write without the fear of offending pious ears.¹⁹

II

The great work for which the Abbé Brémond is best known appears to have been first conceived of as "a thesis for the doctorate on the literary and grammatical interest of devotional books of the seventeenth century." At least, that is how he himself described its genesis in a letter to M. Alfred Loisy in April 1916. The initial volume of the *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux*, which was, in M. Dimnet's words, "actually his candidacy for the Académie," ²⁰ had appeared the year previously. It gave the lie to so dry as dust a notion as Brémond's own modest description of it evokes; but, of course, he was referring only to the first vision

¹⁷ A. F. Loisy: *op. cit.*; p. vi.

¹⁸ Cf. the account of the Abbé's conversation with M. Maurice Martin du Gard as given by the Revd. Henry Hogarth in his *Henri Brémond; the life and work of a devout humanist* (London, S. P. C. K., 1950), p. 34. According to Mr. Hogarth, and his point seems well taken, the subtilty of M. Brémond's remark may best be appreciated after one has read the complete record of this conversation in M. Martin du Gard's *Henri Brémond* (Paris, Éditions du Sagittaire, 1927), pp. 98-101.

¹⁹ Cf. Ernest Dimnet: *My New World*. (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1937), p. 53.

²⁰ E. D. to A. G., as cited above; cf. note 8, *supra*.

he had of the work which was to occupy him for the chief part of the score of years which remained to him. The thought had first come to him during his college days in Wales: when the notion finally attained fruition, it burgeoned on a broader scale than the author had originally conceived.

Instead of the staid volumes of philologic import of which we think when we hear of "a thesis for the doctorate on the literary and grammatical interest of devotional books of the seventeenth century," we find a magnificently rich and extraordinarily diversified garden of delight, a living structure in which we see nature and grace meeting, adapting themselves to each other, and marvelously interpenetrating. It is not like one of those books formed from the beginning according to a rigorously determined and exactly executed plan; it has rather something of the appearance of a forest which spreads out here and there in varied growths which will appear unduly luxuriant to the severe critic. For this very unevenness, it has a naturally compelling charm and a degree of lively verisimilitude enhanced by the enormous number of quotations which distend its bulky pages. The Abbé well knew the rarity of many of the books he cited; he wisely gave us large chunks of the originals in pursuance of his design to allow the sources of his interpretation of the religious spirit in French literature to speak for themselves.

He begins in good sound style to define his purpose and to draw certain distinctions between Christian Humanism and Devout Humanism, the one speculative and academic, the other practical and popular. This statement of principles is followed by exemplification: soon he is launched upon his great theme, making live for us in this and in the following volumes the personalities of such writers as Claude Richome the Jesuit friend of Henri Quatre, S. François de Sales and his followers Binet and Camus, and the Capuchin Yves de Paris.

In succeeding volumes we are introduced to the thought and work of the great mystics of the French school, and we see before us the circumstances and currents that led to the foundation of many major forces in the religious life of France, — forces which are now found represented throughout the Catholic world. Not only the Sulpicians, but the Eudists, and the Lazarists (or Vincen-

tians as they are known in the United States), are outgrowths of movements M. Brémond describes, as well as are numerous congregations of women, the Visitandines, the Daughters of Charity, the Daughters of Wisdom, and the Missionaries of the Company of Mary.

Representatives of the more ancient religious families in the Church are not neglected: on the practical level of one who bespeaks a manner and a habit of speech which would make religious life pleasant as well as holy, he quotes some wise advice from the Dominican nun, Juliane Morelle of Avignon; and he devotes a large section in which sublimity of thought mingles with extreme vivacity of expression, to the characteristic spirit of the French Carmelite nuns. Despite a misunderstanding by some commentators, the Carmelite tradition has a strongly humanistic side, a fact recently brought into sharp relief in the translation of the letters of Santa Teresa which has been published by Professor E. Allison Peers.

With the fourth volume of the *Histoire littéraire* we are plunged into the atmosphere of Port Royal. Here M. Brémond shows himself to be a guide who recognizes the merits of the Port Royalists as well as the uncritical adulation of which they have been the victims. Naturally, as a protagonist of devout humanism, he is unsympathetic to — or is, as we might say, unable to endorse — their display of the dour aspects of Jansenism; but by his very sensitive sense of what actually does constitute a *theological* Jansenist, he avoids that indiscriminate use of the term which so considerably diminishes the value of many contributions to the literature of the period. In this context, thoughtful students will be disposed to admit that he is perhaps the most trustworthy guide in the maze of a delicate and vexed question. Indeed, it may be said here that the pages in which Msgr. Ronald Knox attempts to take issue with M. Brémond's judgments on how Jansenism is manifested are among the few ill-advised sections of the English scholar's great study of Enthusiasm. Curiously enough as I see it, Professor Sykes tells us that in his treatment of the Jansenists Msgr. Knox is too much influenced by the Abbé Brémond, "admittedly antipathetic toward Jansenism."²¹ I should be among

²¹ Cf. the review, by N. Sykes, of Knox's book in *The Journal of Theological*

the last to deny Brémond's antipathy to Jansenistic overstressing of the *vertical* element in religion or, for that matter, even to wish it were otherwise; yet I think that what will be revealed by a careful comparison of the methods used by the two writers will serve to enforce the distinction which is made here. I do not think it can be denied that Msgr. Knox certainly permits himself far greater freedom in applying the label *Jansenist* than did M. Brémond.

Blaise Pascal, like Cardinal Newman, was a character who possessed a strong interest for Brémond, and his pages on that strange and fascinating genius who manifested his talents in such diverse ways — writing telling prose, engaging in abstruse mathematical speculations, inventing a calculating machine, devising the omnibus as a conveyance through the streets of Paris, and expressing the deeply Catholic devotion found in the *Mystère de Jésus* — have been considered by some to be among the most valuable of the Abbé's writings.

To attempt to analyze the *Histoire littéraire* would be an impossible task: it is a work which must be sampled in itself to be properly savored. And the sampler will be rare indeed who is not impelled to deeper draughts of the Abbé's inspiring wine. Each reader will, of course, have his own favorite volumes and passages. Many have been found to prefer the earlier volumes on the ground that the psychological interest is greater in the first five or six of these than in the somewhat "metaphysical" atmosphere of the latter parts of the work. My chief favorites are, however, volumes nine and ten, *La vie chrétienne sous l'ancien régime*, and *La prière et les prières de l'ancien régime*. These volumes match my own pre-occupation with a rewarding if little-known page in the history of the French Church. It is in them that M. Brémond gives us a vivid insight into the true motives of those bishops and scholars whose efforts to reform or recast the time-honored formularies of liturgical worship have been much misrepresented by historians of the romantic school of the last century whose false

Studies, new series vol. 2; pt. 2 (October 1951), p. 217. For an attempt — not very successful, I think, — to state still another view as between the readings of the character of Jansenism given by Knox on the one hand and Brémond on the other, see a suggestive passage toward the end of a review of the former's book by Fr. Ch. P. Loughran, S.J.: "Knox on Enthusiasm"; *Thought* 26 (Summer 1951), pp. 279-83.

assumptions and unwise prejudices still exert a certain influence. Dom Guéranger, for example, despite his very real service to the cause of liturgical studies, was blinded by a strong hatred for the *ancien régime* and seems to have been incapable of appreciating any aspect of its religious and spiritual contribution to the body of Christian thought and life. By way of redressing the balance, the Abbé Brémond, in his narrative of the liturgical and sacramental life as it flourished in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and in his analysis of the devotional reading and the forms of public worship then in vogue, vindicates the wisdom of the liturgiologists of that period. His work suggests the thought that their effort to accommodate the prayer-life of the church to the necessities of their time is paralleled in our own day by the revision of the order of the breviary psalter authorized by Pius X in November 1911, and by the determining spirit of the liturgical changes which have been slowly and moderately revealing their shape during the reign of the present Pontiff. It is in these two volumes, with their exposition of French liturgical reforms later to be taken almost as a pattern by Rome, that M. Brémond provides an incontrovertible defence of a century which has wrongfully been pilloried as devoid of the religious spirit not only by literary Jacobins anxious to justify the French Revolution but as well by some romanticist liturgists whose misreading of history and neglect of sources has led them to the formation of a number of extremely ill-founded conclusions.

The *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France, depuis les guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours*, was left uncompleted at the death of its author. Instead of extending, as the title promises, to our own times, it stopped short before the nineteenth century. But its value is in no wise diminished for that: M. Brémond had treated masterfully of periods which he was, by temperament, peculiarly capable of appreciating and interpreting. That another might have done this as well seems more unlikely than that some modern writer may easily arise to limn the features of latter-day spirituality, less a *terra incognita* to men of the hour because nearer to them by time and by associative thought.

During the final decade of M. Brémond's life not all his activities were devoted to the *Histoire littéraire*, now become, after

volume six, of strongly theological interest. He produced also certain works of a predominantly literary character, and he was drawn into the controversial arena upon at least two occasions. His theories on the nature and function of poetry, expressed in *La Poésie pure*, and in *Prière et Poésie* (1926), touched off a discussion in which a number of the leading French *litterateurs* joined. The principles which this discussion served to unveil are radically those which distinguish the viewpoint of the Christian Humanist from other ideas of the nature of man: many who disagreed with the Abbé's conclusions in the matter would find that a philosophical examination of their own conceptions would reveal either that they did not fully understand, or that they did not accept as true, that organic concept of man generally classified as scholastic.

But a controversy probably more extensive and certainly more acrimonious was roused by the publication in 1929 of M. Brémond's study of Armand de Rancé of La Trappe. The French original, bearing the prophetic title of *L'Abbé Tempête*, was followed in 1930 by Mr. Frank Sheed's English translation, *The Thundering Abbot*. From any point of view, it must be allowed that the titles chosen by author and translator alike had bearing in more than one connection.

The book has been called even by admirers, an imaginative study: ²² it was claimed by adverse critics that the picture drawn by M. Brémond of the austere Abbot of La Trappe is wholly a figment of the author's fancy. Many commentators entered the lists, opinions waxing warmer until a distinguished Irish Cistercian, Dom Ailbe Luddy, published a reply called *The Real De Rancé*, which gave the literary world an opportunity of putting into practice the maxim, *Audi alteram partem*.

Perhaps it would be unjust to assume that, save in its motivation, D. Luddy's zeal for the rectification of history was fathered by that filial piety toward a venerated religious founder which has, during the life-time of Christianity, been responsible for so

²² This I take to be Mr. Hogarth's meaning when he writes of *L'Abbé Tempête* as "an *imaginary* [italics mine] portrait, founded on data which the writer's predilections led him to select. It is as partial as Pascal's *Provinciales*; it approaches them in brilliance; and it is more of an artistic entity." — Henry Hogarth: *Henri Brémond; the life and work of a devout humanist*. (London, S. P. C. K., 1950), p. 162.

much of the picturesque and *edifying* detail we encounter in hagiographical writing. His book is clearly the result of a painstaking, at times almost painful, effort to write factual history, although it has not seemed to every reader that he has quite succeeded in disposing of several of the more serious criticisms Brémond made of De Rancé. But, in any event, the inferiority in literary craftsmanship is not less than manifest: even those who may consider The Real De Rancé to be the truer picture would scarcely prevail upon most readers to doubt that L'Abbé Tempête provides the more living one. D. Luddy's holy founder and spiritual father never moves with the sureness and vividness of the man who fairly leaps out at us from Brémond's pages. Readers who find D. Luddy's interpretation to accord better, I will not say with their prepossessions but with their reading of the facts, must admit that it lacks the fire and liveliness of M. Brémond's presentation of the Abbot of La Trappe, howsoever *imaginary* that presentation may be termed. And, of course, granting or not the more favorable character which D. Luddy allows to Armand de Rancé in contrast to the figure depicted in L'Abbé Tempête, it is not to be expected that one who himself held so low a view of human nature could be a sympathetic subject for M. Brémond. He was ever disposed to regard the friction within man as the effort to effect an harmonious synthesis of the intellectual and sensible elements in man's nature rather than as a war to the death between the essentially opposed parts of a real dichotomy; consequently he simply could not see soundness in De Rancé's notion that a person who enters upon religious life and the search for the way of perfection should be considered a criminal seeking by chastisements to gain the grace of God. Once again, we see Brémond as the representative of the *horizontal* tendency; and in this controversy it is by a radical unlikeness in their view of man's nature that the Abbé's critics are to be differentiated from him. On the other hand, were all that D. Luddy charges of Brémond's picture of De Rancé true, the atrabilious image there depicted would retain a terrible validity in regard to others. De Rancé, *teste* D. Luddy, may not have had it, but there is something which certain religious and ecclesiastical superiors cherish

in the belief that it is the De Rancé spirit which, even to-day, exhibits fitful signs of life.

M. Brémond's own defence of the point of view exhibited in his book is characterized by his habitual attitude of urbane subtilty. Freely acknowledging the evidence that De Rancé was at least one of the few men who have belied the adage that no one is a hero to his valet, Brémond asks:

"Would Antoine read what I write without astonishment and — allowing for his present state — without sadness? In this or that page would he not refuse to recognise his master? Can I afford to ignore his opposition? Between him and me, who is to judge? There are of course in that life many things — gestures, words, writings — which I am better able than Antoine to know of and to estimate. But what man ever translated his whole self into gestures, words, writings? Behind the surface self is another as real, which yet, in the nature of the case, eludes the most ruthless curiosity, the most searching analysis. It has no outward showing save in a certain very mysterious fascination. It is to the existence in Rancé of this hidden self that the impassioned devotion of Antoine bears witness. We know too that many others — two or three generations of Trappists — were, like him, fascinated and held subject. And never forget, for it is a capital thing in him, that Rancé though in the last analysis a good man, was of those — very numerous, too numerous — who are loved more than they will ever love. But could men love them as they do, if in the last recesses of their being, there were not hidden some mysterious thing more loving than love, more virtuous than virtue?" ²³

Is this perhaps a way of suggesting that however much De Rancé desired to emphasize the *vertical* tendency in the attitude he presented to the world, there must have been, in that aspect of his personality which his valet beheld, something of the milder and more humane spirit which characterizes those who display the *horizontal* tendency? In other words, was Armand de Rancé's appeal to his fellow-men based upon their impression that they discerned in him the integrated personality of a man whose nature is developed in its varying facets? Can it be said of him, as generally of those who have sought to transcend the bounds of human

²³ Henri Brémond: *The Thundering Abbot*; translated by F. J. Sheed. (London, Sheed & Ward, 1930), pp. 56-7.

nature, that the truth was too powerful and he could not escape it? Of course, it is the proper function of the historian and the biographer to endeavor to determine whether or not evidence exists, in particular cases, which will serve as an observably authentic basis for such an impression or idea. M. Brémond's contention is that there cannot always be available sufficient data to enable us fully to judge and to estimate the value in the total personality of that hidden self which "has no outward showing save in a certain very mysterious fascination."

It had long been the habit of the Abbé Brémond to divide his time between Paris and the country. He was accustomed to spend about six months at his apartment in an old house in the Rue Chanoinesse (where he had as neighbor the Abbé Ernest Dimnet), and the rest of the year at his villa at Arthez-d'Asson (Basses-Pyrénées), near Pau. While in Paris, he did his research work and took part in the varied activities of the great literary circles of the French capital, circles of which he was a much loved and admired member. At his Provençal retreat he relaxed somewhat with the country people of the neighborhood, visited his friend the Curé, and now and again took part in the clerical *convivia* which, from time to time, enlivened the quiet society of Arthez. Here, too, he worked into the late hours of the night, perfecting his work and preparing his manuscripts for the publisher. Thus he distilled for his readers that "honey," as he called it, which he had gathered during his researches into the books and rare documents he had consulted during the previous six months in Paris.

It was at his beloved country home that he died on the 17th of August 1933 after an illness of several months, the last stages of which had been induced by a stroke in the preceding April, a stroke which was the harbinger of aphasia.

The funeral services were conducted by the Archbishop of Aix-en-Provence, Msgr. François-René Coste; and discourses testifying to the regard and esteem in which Henri Brémond had been held by the official and the learned worlds were pronounced at the grave by a number of distinguished men.

On the first leaf of the little *In Memoriam* card which serves as a souvenir of that occasion and of the man who was the object of the religious and civic observances held on the day of that

funeral ceremony, were printed words which had been written by M. Brémond in the last letter he sent to his nieces, who were both Benedictine nuns:

"Sachons, cette année, accepter le plus joyeusement possible toute ce que la divine tendresse voudra nous faire souffrir."

These words seem to sum up, as pithily as may be, his attitude toward life, while of the face of death he had no less nobly remarked to one of his brothers, in an arrestingly constructed combination of the three languages he loved:

"In manus tuas. . . Je viens juste de lire le dernier chapitre de la vie de M. d'Arenthon, son Directoire de la mort, ne manque pas de le lire, and I have tried to put myself in the shoes of this holy man; sois donc en confiance."

But, on the whole, the most discerning insight into the mind and heart of the Abbé Brémond is perhaps afforded by the thought that the attitude in which this man regarded all things — those of heaven and of earth alike, all aspects of life and of death — is best given utterance and form in the prayer from Cardinal Newman's *Dream of Gerontius* which Henri Brémond had copied into his own Greek Testament: "Lover of souls, great God, I look to Thee!"

III

There has not yet appeared a definitive biography of Henri Brémond; but numerous studies in French and a few in English tell of his life and work while they afford an estimation of the place he holds in the world of letters, a society in which something of its members is preserved in imperishable immortality even after they themselves have passed beyond our company.

M. Brémond's brothers, Père Jean Brémond, and Père André Brémond, both of the Society of Jesus, his friends, M. l'Abbé Ernest Dimnet, and M. Maurice Martin du Gard, have shared with us precious recollections of a great and engaging personality. Not only M. Charles du Bos and M. André Bellesort, but M. Marcel Prévost and M. Lucien Descaves, as well as M. Yves Gandon and Père Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J., are among those

who have written about the Abbé Brémond. More recently, two extended monographs have appeared; M. Albert Autin's *Henri Brémond* was published in Paris in 1947, and the Revd. Henry Hogarth's *Henri Brémond; the life and work of a devout humanist*, in London in 1950. There have been, moreover, several contributions to periodical literature by various authors who have written, from varying points of view, on special aspects of M. Brémond's thought and work. Among these, particular value appears to attach to some essays contributed to *La Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa* by the Revd. Rodrigue Normandin, o.m.i., of that University. He shows a rich and sympathetic knowledge of his subject: one study of Brémond as *Newmaniste française* (1945) is especially important in view of ill-considered opinions expressed by Dr. Edmond Darvil Benard of the Catholic University of America and Père Louis Bouyer of the French Oratory.

In his personal appearance M. Brémond was strikingly impressive, but winning withal, by reason of his affability. M. Lucien Descaves has described him as "tall, slender, and distinguished in appearance"²⁴ while M. Yves Gandon calls him "that tall ecclesiastic of serious mien,"²⁵ words which bring into renewed sharpness of focus a personal recollection of a brief meeting with him many years ago in Paris. "His eyes," says M. André Bellesort, "were of a gentle sweetness, seeming to gaze beyond what was apparent. His lips were marked by a smile almost feminine in its allurements and charm, and his head was Roman in austerity and delicacy of line."²⁶

The Abbé Dimnet pays tribute to the beauty of his friend's voice, which, as he says, lifted the hearer above transitory and petty things.²⁷ He tells us of his conversations with M. Brémond who "for years . . . came to see me every Sunday morning. He would talk for a few minutes in the rich amusing vein under which it pleased him to hide the fundamental seriousness and the smoul-

²⁴ Lucien Descaves: "Henri Brémond tel qu'il m'est apparu"; *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, Paris, 26 août 1933.

²⁵ Yves Gandon: *Imageries critiques*. (Paris: Société française d'éditions littéraires et techniques, 1933), p. 139.

²⁶ André Bellesort: "Discours de réception à l'Académie française"; *Documentation catholique* 35; col. 837.

²⁷ Ernest Dimnet: "Souvenirs"; *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, Paris, 26 août 1933.

dering passion which ran through his books. . .”²⁸ His affability to even casual visitors, and his kindness toward children and animals afford further notes of a richly genial personality. “An egoist in his books,” says M. Dimnet,

“the Abbé Brémond was never an egoist in his personal life. . . He found it no effort to give of himself, his sympathy, his active help, and very generously, of his money, to those who sought his aid. . . Toward ideas he displayed an ironic frankness which could be rather frightening; but toward personalities he could not be other than he naturally was — the charitable Christian and the gentleman.”²⁹

M. Brémond was associated in friendship with some of the leading figures in the Church of the early twentieth century, with men who were in one way or another attached to the Modernist movement, and who were considered by the ultra-orthodox to be marked by a somewhat sinister disposition to revolt against — or, at the best, to grow restive under — the traditional in the thought and the authoritarian in the daily life of the Church. Yet neither the Abbé’s own doctrinal orthodoxy nor his fundamental Catholicity of spirit was ever justly called into serious question.

Although a man of extraordinary learning, and, in the connection in which I am about to speak, one by no means unacquainted, as his preface to the 1932 edition of the *Le Maître de Sacy* translation of St. Luke proves, with the views of latter-day Scriptural scholarship, M. Brémond never became the merciless savant that M. Loisy seems to have been. A savant M. Brémond undoubtedly was; but he remained also a devout child of God and a believer in a very real personal religion as well as one aware of religion’s rich social values. His personality, in this regard, seemed more of a piece than that of another of his friends, the Baron Friederich von Hügel, of whom one oft-times has the feeling that learning and devotional life functioned within departments of the self which were closed to each other.³⁰

²⁸ Id.: *My New World*. (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1937), p. 52.

²⁹ Id.: “Souvenirs”; *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, Paris, 26 août 1933.

³⁰ Nor is an impression of a certain disjointedness in the Baron wholly dissipated by the recent biography of this enigmatic figure in which Count Michael de la Bedoyère attempts to justify his position *vis-à-vis* the men of his time; cf. M. de la Bedoyère: *The Life of Baron von Hügel*. (New York: Scribner’s, 1952). For a much darker view of his character as a theologian, see an essay by the Revd. Humphrey

The contrast between the Abbé Brémond and Fr. Tyrrell is even more striking despite the many ties which bound them.

There has probably never existed a man of ability who has not, from time to time, at least secretly chafed under the restrictive yoke which an authoritarian system imposes; it is equally certain that many men of no proven ability would spend the major portion of their lives openly resisting authority had they the wit to know they were being gently led or cleverly driven by those who make it their *métier* to identify themselves with its channels and agencies.

The truth of these propositions, whether they be timidly or tentatively advanced, is in no wise made nugatory by the accidental terms of their reference: essentially they put into words a condition inseparable from the nature of man as we know him. But the facets of that nature vary, and so do the aspects which they present in response to given circumstances: it is in answer to the challenge which events evoke that men reveal not only their calibre and character but, in a very deep sense, their temperament and the degree and kind of integration which mark their personalities.

It was Tyrrell himself who described his own interest in religion as being "puritanical and Miltonian," while calling that of Brémond, "artistic."³¹ Because of this very fact, the Abbé was never in the position to which Tyrrell's incurably argumentative temperament relentlessly drove him. Fr. Tyrrell must have an answer, even if it be an admittedly tentative and temporary or even an experimental one: his tragedy became inevitable as it grew increasingly apparent that the answer he would insist upon proposing to a difficulty was outrightly unacceptable to "those set over him in the Lord."

In analogous situations, Brémond with his superior suppleness, could always say that the solution he had proposed was, after all,

John Thewlis Johnson, cong. orat.: "Baron v. Hügel and the Catholic Religion" in *Studies* 39 (December 1950), pp. 373-84. Fr. Johnson again states his case in his review of Count de la Bedoyère's book; cf. *The Downside Review*, 69 (October 1951), pp. 500-503.

³¹ He so expressed himself in a letter, dated 9 March 1906, written from Freiburg-im-Breisgau. Cf. *The Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*; ed. by M. D. Petre. (London, Edward Arnold, 1912), II; 265.

based only upon such aspects of the case as he had been able to survey; it wasn't meant to be complete, and there might well be another. In one whose thought ran a gamut of indescribable delicacy of *nuance*, this implied no shirking of the truth: it was the fruit of a great gift of making distinctions and of an unusual sensitiveness in the discernment of shades of meaning. Such refined reasoning was clearly too much for many lesser minds: they must often have felt baffled or uncertain before its quiet urbanity. To employ a philosophic parallelism, it was as lost on them as are the Suarezian *modes* of distinction on a student who has small capacity for the metaphysical.

Herein is displayed the difference between the *prophetic* and somewhat *rude* qualities which marked Tyrrell's religious temperament and the *artistic* tone which, by contrast, distinguished Brémond. Tyrrell must be in the thick of the theological fray. Nor was there ever any uncertainty about the bent of his activity or the direction in which his sympathy, and his determined effort to implement that sympathy, lay. This fact, with all the unhappy consequences which it implies, so true of Fr. Tyrrell's handling of his personal conflicts with his superiors, is the more surprising when we contrast it with the remarkable sensitivity of range he displayed in advising others. As his letters bear witness, Fr. Tyrrell seemed easily to envision every aspect of a situation in just respect to the individual soul he was counselling. But in his own regard, his diagnosis was sometimes unsure, and his chosen remedy for a given situation showed less restraint than might have been expected from one who was, to so many, a most wise and understanding spiritual advisor.

On the other hand, Brémond in even his own case could, as it seems, derive fulfillment from the refined exercises that become an observer. It is not correct to say that he was insufficiently concerned with the theologically 'dangerous' topics which drew Fr. Tyrrell's interest; for many of the matters touched on by M. Brémond were fully as 'explosive' in the eyes of ultra conservatives: his thought, however, was so subtly variegated and was expressed with so consummate a mastery of *nuance* that it must often have escaped the comprehension of bovine loiterers in the pasture.

Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that M. Brémond, too,

did possess and sometimes exemplify a frankness which seemed on occasion to walk wide of discretion. This is well illustrated by his action at the grave of Tyrrell, action unexceptionable in itself, as indeed the Archbishop of Aix, Msgr. Bonnefoy, declared; but fraught with danger in view of the attitude of the Bishop of Southwark in the negotiations preceding the burial.³² Particularly is this seen to be true when we contrast Brémond's openness with all the reticence implied in something said, years later, by another of the Anglo-Irish priest's ex-Jesuit friends, one who had effected, as did Brémond, an amicable withdrawal from the Society.

I recall being told by the former Rector of Whippany in New Jersey, the late Revd. Cornelius Cyprian Clifford,³³ that when shortly after Fr. Tyrrell's death Miss Petre determined (with what Clifford thought to be somewhat intemperate zeal), to get

³² It should be noted that M. Loisy takes a view which seemingly absolves Msgr. Amigo of merely personal animus: he casts for the part of *villain of the piece* the Jesuit, Fr. Jno. Hungerford Pollen, of whom Miss Petre tells us (cf. *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, II; 432), in regard to his calls at Mulberry House on the 12th and 13th of July,

"He had not been one of Fr. Tyrrell's specially intimate friends in the Society; so I had no reason to think Fr. Tyrrell would have wished to be placed in his hands." Loisy's interpretation of the affair is hinted at or exposed in his *George Tyrrell et Henri Brémond*; pp. 20, 21, 25, 28, and esp. pp. 30-6. Yet, in the attempt to make an assessment of this view, one must consider what influence may have been exerted upon M. Loisy's judgment by the recollection of his own case and of the treatment he had himself received. Cf., in this regard, M. D. Petre: Alfred Loisy; his religious significance; p. 50. In the absence of certain documentation, I think it difficult, if not impossible, to essay an exact evaluation of what he suggests. Even in the event, however, that Loisy's reading of the case were shown to be the true one, the result is not more flattering to the character of Msgr. Amigo. He was the incumbent of the See of Southwark; it was for him to make whatever decision had to be made in the matter of the Tyrrell burial and, subsequently, in the point of M. Brémond's part in the *rites* which were actually held. Can it be thought that he is left in any better case than that represented in the text, if it be believed that he merely yielded his episcopal prerogative in the face of influence exerted upon him?

³³ Fr. Clifford (1859-1938), who became canonically affiliated with the American diocese of Newark early in the present century after having withdrawn from the English Province S.J. in 1899, was, during the last twenty-five years of his life, an Instructor in Philosophy at Columbia University, New York, where he is remembered for the depth of his learning and the compelling charm of an unusually attractive personality. See the brief essay in tribute to him, "Cornelius Cyprian Clifford," by Alastair Guinan, in *The Catholic World*, 176 (October 1952), pp. 38-44. It must be observed that an error in editing which is acknowledged in the issue of the month following (cf. *Cath. World*, 176 (November 1952), p. III), is the cause of an inserted "rendering" of Fr. Clifford's Latin motto which makes nonsense of my final paragraph.

out a volume of Tyrrell's letters, she asked the American ex-Jesuit for those he had received in order that they might be printed in the collection.

"They were many," Fr. Clifford said to me; "and they included some of the most unreserved expressions of his feelings towards institutions and individuals, ranging from serious animadversions upon the state of the Church in general to examples of a certain bitter humour characteristic of poor Tyrrell in his later years." He cited two instances of these witticisms: one, a brief epithet that unmistakably revealed the low estimate in which Fr. Tyrrell held the intellectual capacity of a prominent American Metropolitan; the other, a rude pleasantry upon the cardinal's hat then lately granted to an English prelate.

Fr. Clifford responded to Miss Petre's invitation by saying that he felt the best service Fr. Tyrrell's friends could give to his memory at that time was silence. She did not immediately reply; but when the publication of the book was announced at about the time the First World War ended,³⁴ the Rector of Whippany received a post-card picture of Fr. Tyrrell's grave. On it the redoubtable Maude had written: "This is the grave of a *brave* man." Long afterwards, Fr. Clifford remarked to me: "I knew what she meant; but I did not mind."

There are some letters to M. Brémond in the collection, although they contain no such blatantly disrespectful comments as are the flippancies referred to by Fr. Clifford. Yet, despite his careful discretion in this matter, the American shared with the Frenchman a certain ecclesiastical obscurity, and one wonders if, in some sense, both Fr. Clifford and the Abbé Brémond were not the targets, perhaps as a penalty for their friendships, of that species of mild disfavor pointedly expressed by lack of official notice.

Although M. Brémond was honored by France by being made a member of the *Académie* in 1925 in succession to Msgr. Duchesne, and by the University of Oxford which subsequently conferred upon him the degree of D. Litt. *honoris causa*, the Church, which he had served so well, failed inexplicably as it appears to bestow

³⁴ The American edition appeared a little later: George Tyrrell's Letters selected and edited by M. D. Petre. (New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1920).

upon him any honorific prelatical distinction. It is not immediately apparent whether it was by his own disinclination for the *ribbons of rank* or by the inaction of authority, that there was no public recognition of his work of the kind implied by Pontifical permission to assume the sonorous, if somewhat ambiguous, title *Monsignor*. M. Brémond remained simply M. l'Abbé Brémond in the Church; and no higher ecclesiastical designation bore witness to his possession of the qualities which made him so outstanding a figure not alone in the French Church but in the Church Universal during his lifetime.

For one may say that judging from the picture of religion which his writings present to the world, a picture at once attractively winning to the human spirit and orthodoxly devout in its accoutrements, he must unhesitatingly be pronounced to be among the two or three pre-eminent apologists of Christianity to the France of his generation. And it is likely that the appeal of his message will rather increase and widen than diminish with the passage of time. “. . . il fut plus grand que son destin. Mais son oeuvre reste. . . ,” says M. Loisy with simple eloquence.

“L'avenir lui rendre meilleure gloire que ses contemporaines. Il continuera d'exercer chez nous son action salutaire et féconde. Et il est de ceux dont on peut dire, avec l'Évangile (Luc xx, 37), que leur 'Dieu n'est pas un Dieu des morts, mais des vivants, car tous à lui', en lui, et pour lui, à jamais 'vivent'.”⁸⁵

From this point of view, it is perhaps the supreme contribution of the Abbé Brémond to have shown the narrow poverty and the inherent falsity of that “religion of romance” which Jansenists and rigorists have created in their endeavor to overpass the bounds of human nature and to make all Christians a race of supermen like the heroes of the Apostolic Age. M. Brémond has presented us instead with a powerfully attractive — because so appropriate to our nature — view of religion as occupied with normal humanity refined by an awareness of the grace of God. As this view of the work of religion was put by Père François Bonal, one of the Abbé's favorites among the seventeenth century Franciscan writers:

⁸⁵ A. F. Loisy: *op. cit.*; p. 195.

"Christianity is not forever to be found concerned in the making of prophets, or martyrs, or hermits; it also turns out good fathers and good children, good masters and good servants." ³⁶

How nobly does M. Brémond justify what the rigorists would term *worldly religion* when he says:

"Strongly to affirm the liberty of man is not to restrict our responsibility for our acts. Nor can the demand that all our powers unite in the praise of God be called a recommendation of torpor. It is not to be doubted that in the face of human frailty, humanism preferred the side of mercy, and feared over-confidence less than despair. Nevertheless, its own morality, while more humane than that of rigorism, is at once higher and more demanding in its nature. Humanism's favourite doctrine — that of disinterested love — is a means of conducting our souls to the mystic portal whence it seeks with all its might to push them into the sanctuary. It follows logically that its aim is that we begin to become saints." ³⁷

From the theological viewpoint, M. Brémond's attitude is solidly founded in the teaching of the great Tridentine doctors whose insistence on the notion of prevenient grace shows us the unceasing action of Divine Providence, ever drawing us from evil and leading us to good. Devout humanism, as he tells us,

"grafted the mysticism of the Counter-Reformation on to the trees in the orange groves of the Renaissance. It conserved the dazzling enthusiasm of the New Learning; but it reshaped and elevated it by a faith higher and ineluctably joyous, a faith which privation could not sadden nor disquietude make gloomy. Heaven and earth, nature and grace, are its own. Its very purpose and mission is to unite them in a sacred synthesis. No longer is joy to be confined, nor is the gate to its garden locked. The spirit which reigns is that of François de Sales, and we are no longer to think with Joas that 'secular activity is banished' from the devout life. . . The malediction of those who love only the world is not forgotten; but the very world itself is caught up and impregnated with devotion. According to the *Théopneste* of Père Alexis de Jésus, Grace shews him a palace set upon a rock glittering with diamonds, and having three hundred and fifty pavilions and many other

³⁶ F. Bonal: *Le chrétien du temps*, 1685; III; 154, *apud* Henri Brémond: *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France*. (Paris, Bloud & Gay, 1916-34), I; 406.

³⁷ Henri Brémond: *op. cit.*; T. I; pp. 325-6.

mansions matching those of the Empyrean. Is this heaven or the cloister? It is neither; but a picture of the life of this world, wherein many exercise themselves in various virtues, some in mercy, some in wisdom, others in justice, nobility, literature, or manly affairs, all under the rulership of devotion, with the faces of angels and heavenly conversation. . . . They are beloved and prized by heaven and earth while they are happy and content in a paradise of all the good things of the present life even as they look to the final attainment of a better."³⁸

This attitude toward the present life, an exemplification of the *horizontal* tendency or viewpoint, is in accord with scholastic teaching on the nature of man, and on the desirability and legitimacy of natural happiness as a proper prelude and preparation to the fulfillment and completion of the whole man, a fulfillment which is promised rather to those who bring to fruition their divinely created and endowed human nature than to those who contemptuously trample it underfoot and endeavor to destroy it by rejecting it as an inadequate gift.

Henri Brémond has been compared to Sainte-Beuve as an *interpreter of souls*. Sainte-Beuve, however, wrote without the theological pre-occupation which is never long absent from the thought of the Abbé, and the result in Brémond's work is a more richly-rounded view of the personality under study than even the great author of the *Lundis* was able to give us. In Brémond's view all parts of the man come under analysis, and the manifestation even of wit, humor, and the other natural instincts, is seen as something basically divine. His admiration of his subject is far from being uncritical, and he is quick to seize upon those little details and circumstances of motive and action which reveal the common touch of humanity. A gently tolerant humor, indicating a profound knowledge of the bent and ways of man, is never wanting in his pages; and now and again he dips his pen in that refined irony in the use of which French writers are unequalled.

It is, in the broadest sense, as an interpreter of men and women dowered with the gifts and graces of human nature, as well as retarded and encumbered by its faults, that M. Brémond's great-

³⁸ Id.: op. cit.; T. I; pp. 358-9. In these three passages from Brémond's great work, as in all other citations from the French in the present essay, the translations, except where noted, are my own.

ness lies: he dissects for us, in his kindly but supremely entertaining fashion, not only the souls but the full human personalities of those of whom he writes, so that, saving that very mysterious personal radiation which cannot easily be pinned down, these personalities grow as real to us as those we see daily around us. As an historian and biographer as well as a religious teacher, the Abbé Brémond powerfully emphasizes the answer to life's problems which lies at the hand of one who knows that it is by the sanctification of all aspects of human existence that we best develop the whole man and bring to fullest realization the nature of the being made by God and made capable of self development in the reasonable use of all aspects of created existence.

M. Maurice Martin du Gard was absent from France when the Abbé Brémond died, and he tells us that for this reason "it is easier for me to picture him in life. In the twilight of a June evening rays from the sun lie athwart the towers of Notre-Dame. He opens his window, and we lean out silently from the balcony as the changing shafts of evening light make us forget the seductive puppets of the literary life. Then he talks to me of the glory of this world."³⁹

The men and women of this world, if they purpose to preserve its characteristic glory as that has flowered in Western Christian civilization, stand particularly in need to-day of the message of devout humanism, that message whose persuasive witness was Henri Brémond. Despite an access of volubility which from time to time distinguishes the too intellectual, or the overly ascetic, who would emphasize one or another aspect of Christian culture at the expense of the whole, we need not doubt that those who have a truly comprehensive grasp of that culture's vital tradition will continue to proclaim the exalted place which human feeling and emotion exert in Christianity's most representative schools of thought. Indeed, insofar as the historic Great Church is concerned, it seems indisputable that, considerations of pure theology aside, the most recent dogmatic definition which has emanated from the Vatican, that of the corporeal assumption of the holy Virgin, is an insistence upon the worth and the essential truth of

³⁹ Maurice Martin du Gard: *Harmonies critiques*. (Paris, Éditions du Sagittaire, 1936), p. 17.

an humane view of life. To an age grown accustomed to the divergently motivated despal of the human body so blatantly urged upon us by totalitarians on the one hand and so firmly — if from so superficially opposed viewpoints — proclaimed by hedonistic libertines and grim-faced ascetics on the other, this exaltation of one who, as Christians believe, brought her human capacities as woman and mother to the greatest possible degree of fruition, finds a most striking justification from the philosophical and cultural angles in the testimony it bears to a view of life which looks forward to the ennoblement of every aspect of man's nature by fulfillment and by loving development rather than by that disregard or harsh pruning of what rigorists and unbelievers alike are apt to regard as its "coarser" and "merely transitory" features.

It is Henri Brémond's lasting service to religious thought that he not only represented the attractiveness and the reasonableness of this humane view of life, but also traced for us the living rivulets through which we may follow it back to the words and the person of Him who said, "the Sabbath was made for man." For the Founder of Christianity is, in any fair account of the matter, the supreme Humanist: it is He alone who could, among all the children of men, most fully take to Himself the words of the old Latin dramatist who wrote down that imperishably compelling thought: *Homo sum, et nihil humanum a me alienum puto*. And, for us, the lesson was drawn by St. Bernard of Clairvaux in a sermon which is quoted as one of the readings for Matins of Advent Sunday in the Breviary formerly used in the diocese of Versailles: *Adveniens enim Salvator reformabit corpus humilitatis nostrae, configuratum corpori claritatis suae, si tamen prius fuerit cor reformatum, et configuratum humilitati cordis ipsius. Propter quod et dicebat: Discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde. Ergo illam virtutum formam teneamus, quam verbo et exemplo commendavit Christus praesens in carne; siquidem omnis virtus nostra tam longe est a vera virtute, quam longe est ab ea forma.*⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Sermo sancti Bernardi abbatis de Adventu, 4, n.5, apud Breviarium Versaliense . . . DD. Stephani-Joannis-Francisci Borderies Episcopi Versaliensis auctoritate . . . editum. (Versailles, Angé; Paris, Poussielgue-Rusand, 1828), Dom. I Adventus, ad officium nocturnum, in ii noct., lectio iv.

This is teaching which might be matched in the doctrine expounded by Henri Brémond in a score of places, as when he wrote: "L'active présence de Dieu nous divinise à notre insu"; ⁴¹ or, "*Deus erat in Christo*, et il est en nous puisque nous sommes revêtus du Christ. . . Chardon nous fait saisir au plus intime de l'âme en état de grâce la réalité puissante, massive, active, accablante, crucifiante de cette présence . . . ; ⁴² or, "Dans la prière la plus chétive se renouvelle obscurément le miracle de la Pentecôte"; ⁴³ or again, "Toute inspiration poétique est en elle-même un don de Dieu et devrait nous aider dans notre ascension." ⁴⁴

⁴¹ Henri Brémond: *Histoire littéraire*, VII; 100.

⁴² *Ibid.*; VIII; 31.

⁴³ *Ibid.*; VIII; 260.

⁴⁴ Henri Brémond: *Prière et Poésie*. (Paris, Bernard Grasset, 1926), p. 208, note.

MIDDLE ENGLISH VERSIONS OF "CRISTE QUI LUX ES ET DIES"

ROSSELL HOPE ROBBINS

SAUGERTIES, NEW YORK

JUDGED by its survival in manuscripts, the most popular Latin hymn in Middle English translations was "*Criste qui lux es et dies*." Challenged only by "*Ave Maris stella*" in six versions,¹ and trailed by three hymns extant in three MSS. each ("*Alma redemptoris mater*," "*Hostis Herodes impie*," and "*Vexilla regis prodeunt*"²), this piece is found in eight different versions, all except one of the fifteenth century:

(1) Cryst þat art [boþe d]ay and lyht / Thow vnihlist þe mirknasse
of nyht

Index, No. 615. Egerton 3245 [*olim* Gurney], f. 198^r (end xiv century). Seven quatrains (*aabb*).

Robbins, "The Gurney Series of Religious Lyrics," PMLA, LIV (1939), 387.

(2) Cryst þat art boope day and light / And sooþefaste sonne of al
gladnesse

Index, No. 614. By Lydgate. Trinity Coll. Camb. 600, p. 195; Harley 2251, f. 235^v (second quarter xv century). Seven 8-line stanzas (*ababbcbc*).

MacCracken, EETS, e. s. CVII. 235-237.

(3) Cryst that day ert and lyght / that tornes the merknes of the
nyght

Not listed in Index. Harley 1260, f. 196^r (xv century). Five quatrains (*aabb*).

Printed here (A).

(4) Crist qui lux es et [di]es / o Iesu crist þe verray lycht

Index, No. 612. Advocates 1. 1. 6, p. 13 and again at p. 101; Univ. of Edinburgh 205, f. 120^v (after 1477). Seven 8-line stanzas (*ababbcbc*).

Ritchie, The Bannatyne MS., (STS), I. 21-23; II. 50-51; Stevenson, STS, LXV. 20-21.

¹ Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, The Index of Middle English Verse (New York, 1943), Nos. 454, 1054, 1079, 1081, 1082, 3887 (new first line: "Ayl be þow ster of se").

² Ibid., p. 762, under "Latin hymns."

- (5) Cryst þat art boþe lygt and day / Derkenesse of nygt þou doyst
away

Index, No. 616. Harley 665, f. 299^v (late xv century). Seven monorhyming quatrains.

Printed here (B).

- (6) Crist that art light clerenes and day / Derknes of nyght doist
away

Index, No. 619. By Ryman. Camb. Un. Ee. 1. 12, f. 3^v (1492). Seven quatrains (*aabb*).

Zupitza, "Die Gedichte des Franziskaners Jakob Ryman," Archiv. LXXXIX (1892), 325-326.

- (7) Crist thatt arte light and day also / Derkenes of nyght puttist
us fro

Index, No. 617. By Ryman. Camb. Un. Ee. 1. 12, f. 4^r (1492). Seven quatrains (*aabb*).

Zupitza, *ibid.*, pp. 326-327.

- (8) Criste that art light and day so bright / Derkenes of nyght
turnyst to light

Index, No. 618. By Ryman. Camb. Un. Ee. 1. 12, f. 31^v (1492). Seven quatrains (*aabb*).

Zupitza, *ibid.*, p. 196.

The earliest English version, however, is not listed above; in the Durham Hymnal is an Anglo-Saxon gloss on the six quatrains (including the doxology) of the original Latin used "*ad Completorium*."³ This form is, of course, not poetic; the exact Anglo-Saxon equivalents are merely written above the Latin. Subsequent to the many Middle English versions, the hymn continued popular (as suggested by the Bannatyne MS. of 1568). After the Reformation it was englished by Coverdale in his *Goostly Psalmes* of 1539; and it was one of the few Latin office hymns retained in the *Preces Privatae* published with the sanction of Queen Elizabeth.⁴ Today

³ J. Stevenson, *The Latin Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Surtees Society, XXXIII (Durham, 1851), pp. 12-13. The MS. is "a little later than the Norman Conquest" (p. viii) and contains "the bulk of the hymns used in the Anglican Church" before the Conquest (p. x).

⁴ William Keatinge Clay, *Private Prayers of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, Parker Society (Cambridge, 1851), p. 269, used at Vespers. In the *Orarium* of 1560, a hymn imitated from *Te lucis ante terminum* is used for Compline (*ibid.*, p. 156), and this is translated in the 1559 *Primer* (*ibid.*, p. 44). Most of the customary hymns were taken over directly into the *Primer*.

in the Anglican Church it is included in Hymns Ancient and Modern (No. 105) ⁵ and in the English Church Hymnal (No. 81).

Criste qui lux es et dies is now identified with the Mozarabic ⁶ rites of the fourth century; and it is mentioned by name as early as the middle of the sixth century.⁷ Like so many hymns, it was fathered on St. Ambrose. The first MSS. are Irish and Anglo-Saxon, attesting to its great popularity in England and Ireland in the early Middle Ages. The *Analecta Hymnica* lists nine such MSS. to the eleventh century.⁸ The Mozarabic and Ambrosian versions are printed in the great collections of Migne, Drèves, Daniel and Chevalier,⁹ but these texts differ somewhat from the Latin of all the English MSS. (e.g. *lucisque lumen crederis*, v. 3, appears as *lucifer lucem praeferens* in the Mozarabic texts). The hymn is always found, either in limited use (Lent, Advent, Sundays) or daily, at Compline.

Both translations printed here for the first time occur in Harley MSS.

Harley MS. 1260 (Text A) is a *Horae* with many miscellaneous prayers and rubrics in Latin and French.¹⁰ The hymn appears, written as part of the complete MS., with rubricated capitals, toward the end of the collection and is followed by the only other English verse in the MS., a translation of "*Memento nostri domine*" ("Lorde of us thou haue menyng").¹¹ A few English re-

⁵ Hymns Ancient and Modern (Historical Edition), (London, 1909), p. 146, refers to a Tudor four-part composition in B.M. Addit. MSS. 18936-9.

⁶ Ruth Ellis Messenger, *The Medieval Latin Hymn* (Washington, 1953), p. 17; three such texts are printed by Guido Drèves [et alii], *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, XXVII (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 111.

⁷ Drèves, *ibid.*, LI (Leipzig, 1908), p. 23 — Caesarius of Arles in 542.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Migne, *Patrologica Latina*, XVII. 1176 (attributed to St. Ambrose); Adalbert Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* (Halis, 1841), I. 33, IV. 54; Guy Ulysse Chevalier, *Repertorium Hymnologicum* (Louvain, 1892), I. 173, No. 2934.

¹⁰ A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts (London, 1808), I. 637-638.

¹¹ The Latin appears on f. 196^v and the English follows on f. 197^v. This text is not listed in the Index.

Lorde of us thou haue menyng
her in this heuy dwellyng
thow that of oure sawles ert defendower
be neght tille us in euerilk stowre

Lorde ne forget thou noght
the prayeris of pouer men that thou wrought
of mek menne the prayeris thou here
in this werlde of angres sere

ceipts are added at the end pages — “for stynkyng Breth that cumys owte of the stommake” and for other disturbances.

Harley MS. 665¹² (Text B) is a collection of doctrinal treatises in Latin, including *De Decem Mandatis* (ff. 50–80), *De Septem Peccatis Mortalibus* (ff. 81–90), *Topica sive Loci Communes Theologici* (ff. 91–170), *Praecepta moralia et theologica* (ff. 171–223), and *De Erroribus circa Septem Sacramenta* (ff. 224–287). There are shorter pieces scattered throughout: at the beginning some grammatical tracts, and at the end a number of added scraps, including directions for making a sauce “to make a man to have appetite to mete” (f. 288), and the epitaph on Riche Alane (f. 294).¹³ After the last stanza of the hymn appears:

Planus sermo vsque ad cor penetrat	
politus autem pascit aures	
Playn word entereth the hert	} mens sanis
I-flarysched the eeres feedyt	

The texts follow as they appear in their MSS. (with punctuation added). Comments which a few of the lines necessitate are given in the footnotes.

(A) Harley MS. 1260

idem ympnus in anglico:

f. 196^r

Cryst that day ert and lyght,
that tornes the merknes of the nyght,
of lyght thou ert trew lyghtnes,
prechand lyght that blyssid es.

4

To cry to the lorde es oure thoght
forsake us lorde ne well thou noght
haste the sone and dwell noght lange
and saue us wreches fra bitter bande

Thow god cryst oure saueowre
and oure endeles defendowre
we wyet lorde in to thi hande
oure sawles when we sal heryen wende
amen

¹² A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts, I. 400–401.

¹³ Index, No. 1207; printed in my *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Oxford, 1952), p. 118.

Thowe holy lorde, we the pray,
 defende us in this nyght and day;
 owre restinge euer mot be in the,
 and restfulle nyght gyuen til us be. 8

Lit heuy sclepe be noght on falland,
 ne owre enmy us oure-comande,
 ne owre flesche lowande to hym;
 we yelde us gylty to the of syne. 12

Owre eghen swylke sclepe mot take
 that owre hert ay to the wake.
 yeme thi seruandes wyth thi ryght hande,
 the whilke that the ere here loueande. 16

Owre defendoure bihalde a-bowt,
 Than that us wayttes thow donne gilowt;
 rewyl thi seruandes the whylk ere thine,
 that with thi blode thow bowght fro pyne. 20

(B) Harley MS. 665

Iesu nostra redemptio Amor *et* Desiderium. f. 299^v

¶ Criste, qui lux es *et* dies,
 noctis tenebras detegis,
 lucisque lumen crederis,
 lumen beatum predicans. 4

Cryst, þat art boþe lygt *and* day,
 Derkenesse of nygt þou doyst away,
 lygt of lygt men may the say,
 A blysfull lygt prechyng vs Ay. 8

¶ Precamur, sancte domine,
 defende nos in hac nocte;
 sit nobis in te requies,
 quietam noctem tribue. 12

We pray the, holy lord of mygt,
 Kepe vs thys nygt fro wycked wygt;
 Oure rest in the be rewlyd *with* rygt,
 And grawnt vs all an esy nygt. 16

¶ Ne grauis sompnus irruat,
 nec hostis nos surripiat,
 nec caro illi consenciens,
 nos tibi reos statuatur. 20

No grevous slepe agens vs be;
 The fynd þou make fro vs fle,
 þat neuer the flesch asseutyð be
 To make vs gilty, lord, to thee. 24

¶ Oculi sompnum capiant,
 cor ad te semper vigilet;
 Dexterā tuā protegat
 famulos, qui te diligunt. 28

Oure eyen take slepe vn-to thy pay,
 Oure hert wake to thee allewey,
 þi ryght hand defende hem Ay,
 þy seruantys þat the love and pray. 32

¶ Defensor noster, aspice,
 insidiantes reprime,
 gubernā tuos famulos,
 quos sanguine mercatus es. 36

Behold to vs, defender god,
 Put doon our enmys wyld and wood; f. 300^r
 þu governe hem þat bawȝtyst on rood,
 lord Iesu, with thy swete blode. 40

¶ Memento nostri, domine,
 in graui isto corpore,
 qui es defensor anime;
 adesto nobis, domine. 44

haue mynd on vs, þu lord so dere,
 In thys heue body here,
 þou þat savest mannys sowle fro where,
 When we haue nede þou be vs nere. 48

Deo patri sit gloria,
 eiusque soli filio
 cum spiritu peraclito
 et nunc et in perpetuum. 52

lovyng vn-to þat fader be,
 And to his commely soon so fre,
 Wyth þe holy gost, oon god þey þre —
 Now and Ay, Amen say we. 56

Of the eight versions six are in quatrains, and these naturally are closer to the original than either No. 2 or No. 4 which are both in the 8-line ballade stanza. These latter texts have to be padded in various ways. No. 4 incorporates the first and last lines of the Latin quatrain into the rhyme-scheme of the English 8-line stanza, and adds two lines of devotional platitudes. The first stanza, for example, gives a straightforward translation of Latin lines 1 and 2, then inserts a repetition of line 2; line 5 of the English translates the Latin, and then come two lines which are at best only a remote paraphrase:

Christe qui lux es et dies,
 o Jesu chryst, the verry licht
 and day þat vndois all dirknes,
 vncouering mirknes of the nycht,
 Thow licht of licht belevit richt,
 Thow grant ws all ay but disperance
 Of thy visage to haif a sicht,
 Lumen beatum predicans.

Lydgate reaches eight lines by similar devices: lines 2 and 7 are his own (not even suggested by the Latin); the expected four lines of translation are eked out to five by a couple of kennings ("souereyne light"; "in soþefastenes"), and line 8 is from the Latin which in each stanza precedes the English: ¹⁴

Cryst þat art boope day and light,
 And soþefaste sonne of al gladnesse,
 þat doost away derknesse of night —
 And souereyne light of al brightnesse
 Beleved art in soþefastenesse,
 Preching þis blissful light of pees,
 Be oure socour in alle distresse,
 Criste qui lux es et dies.

The quatrain versions all attempt to reproduce the octosyllabic metre of the Latin. Ryman, for example, can be seen experimenting to secure an adequate translation. On f. 3^v of his MS., he turns the first stanza five different ways,¹⁵ in addition to his three

¹⁴ There are several misreadings in the Latin headings, which are corrected in the English stanzas, e.g., st. 3 *Ne grauis compuis irruat*; st. 4 *Oculi sompnum capiantis*. The Bannatyne MS reads st. 2 as *noctem quietem tribue*.

¹⁵ Zupitza, Archiv, LXXXIX (1892), 326-327.

translations. The first experiment approximates No. 7, but Ryman has altered his last line from "þe kyng of myght euer to be" to "The faders sone of myght euer to be." Elsewhere he strays just as far from the Latin. It might be remarked that No. 6 resembles No. 8 rather than No. 7, although its last stanza is the same as No. 7. In No. 8, stanzas 1, 2, (4), 6 and 7 are themselves similar to the corresponding stanzas of No. 7.

The existence of translations of Latin hymns into English poses the question whether they were used for congregational singing. From the evidence of the MSS. of this translation (incidentally supported by other sources) the answer is "No." Harley MS. 1260 is obviously a book for private devotions, to be read in the home or taken to church for personal meditation during the services. An indication of its usage is given by Item 77 (in the catalogue), f. 236: "Advice, in French, as it seemeth, to the Lady owner of this book, how to govern herself, with reference to Devotion and Religious exercises." Harley MS. 665 was probably designed for a parish priest, as suggested by the solemn form of Cursing at f. 300^r as well as by the doctrinal treatises. The Gurney text is one of a series of short prayers added to a Pricke of Conscience and is clearly intended for private and personal use. Ryman's three texts are part of his whole MS., which includes a colophon on f. 80^r showing his purpose was similar to that of the so-called English Hymnal,¹⁶ namely, devotional exercises for closet use:

Explicit liber ymptorum et canticorum quem composuit
Frater Iacobus Ryman ordinis Minorum ad laudem omnipotentis
dei et sanctissime matris eius Marie omniumque sanctorum
anno domini millesimo cccc^{mo} lxxxii^o ¹⁷

The remaining two longer versions were made for pious relaxation. The Bannatyne text (No. 4) expressly states its function:

and grant ws grace þat we ma say
This ympne so plesandly to the,
To bed quhen þat we boun ws ay.

¹⁶ Twenty-two rhyme-royal translations (containing the only known ME versions of the Office hymns of the Psalter) in B.M. MS. Addit. 34193, printed by Frank A. Patterson, *Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis* (Paris, 1927), pp. 443.

¹⁷ Richard Leighton Greene, *The Early English Carols* (Oxford, 1935), p. 393.

Lydgate wrote his "ympe" "in wyse of balade"; both MSS. in which it occurs are collections of formal religious and secular poetry.

These two texts of "*Criste qui lux es et dies*" printed here testify to the importance, even at this late date, of the liturgy, especially of the Latin hymns, in molding the content and form of the Middle English religious lyric. This importance is perhaps more spectacularly revealed by the statistics that of the 1900 or so religious lyrics in Middle English, nearly 200 are either direct translations or very close paraphrases of Latin hymns.

NOTES TO THE TEXTS

(A)

10 *oure-comande* *NED* over (prep. 2) gives first ref. over-comand 1600 11
towande (pres. part.) be humbling 12 *yelde* yield (*NED* 18 acknowledge)
 15 *yeme* take care of 17 *Than* then 17 *gilowt* to bow (down); probably
 a survival of causative prefix *ge* to make to; the prefix *y* had a Northumbrian
 form *gi*.

(B)

17 Cf st. 3 of the Salisbury rite Compline hymn: *Ne mentem somnus opprimat /*
Nec hostis nos surripiat / Nec ullis caro petimus / Commaculetur sordibus 23
asseutyd assault (*NED* 6 to tempt, first ref. More, 1529) 32 *pray* MS. pay
 47 *where* danger, peril 53 *lovyng* praise 54 MS. his his

THE CHRONOLOGY OF VETTIUS VALENS' ANTHOLOGIAE

1. In 1900 W. Kroll came to the conclusion that Vettius Valens lived under the Antonines.¹ Indeed one finds, scattered over the whole work, some forty references to specific dates as examples for the astrological methods under discussion, these dates ranging from Nero 1 (A.D. 54) to Antoninus 21 (A.D. 157).

2. Preparing a comprehensive work on Greek horoscopes in coöperation with Dr. B. L. Van Hoesen, I undertook the astronomical dating of all the horoscopes quoted (without dates) by Vettius Valens. The result is very striking. The two earliest horoscopes concern the years A.D. 37 and 50, the two latest, A.D. 173 and 188 respectively. All the rest, about a hundred examples, belong to the interval from A.D. 61 to 162.

3. In V,10 a series of thirteen horoscopes is quoted, the dates ranging between 102 and 153. In all these cases, events in specific years of the lives of the persons are quoted and explained as consequences of the horoscopic configuration. In no case is the death of one of these persons reported. If, however, we add the latest year quoted to the astronomically determined date of birth we obtain, following the arrangement in the text,

p. 227,28	134 (Nov. 4) + 23 = 157/158
228,15	111 (April 24) + 46 = 157
228,31	107 (May 8) + 51 = 158
229,6	135 (Oct. 27) + 32 = 157/158
229,13	112 (July 27) + 45 = 157
230,7	110 (Sept. 27) + 47 = 157/158
230,11	153 (May 8) + 4 = 157
230,14	102 (Dec. 4) + 45 = 157/158
230,18 ²	120 (May 12) + 36 = 156
230,22	122 (Jan. 22) + 35 = 157
230,32	114 (Nov. 10) + 44 = 158/159
231,5	123 (Jan. 2) + 32 = 155
231,32	113 (July 1) + 20 = 133/134

¹ Catal. Cod. Astrol. Graec. II, p. 86; cf. also the preface to Kroll's edition p. VI (1908). All references in the following mean Kroll's edition. [Vettius Valens is an author of so much importance not only for astrology proper but also for 'mysticism astral' and religious feeling that it is extremely welcome to have a precise dating. A.D.N.]

² In line 19 read: Ζεὺς [Ζυγῶ] Ἄρης Παρθένω.

Thus it is evident that Book V was written in the years 157 and 158.

4. The last horoscope in the above list is used once more in VII,5, where events from the years 47, 48, 49 of the subject are quoted, i.e., events from A.D. 160 to 162 or 163. If we repeat the same procedure for the rest of chapter VII,5 we find the following dates: 161, 159, 160, 164, 142, 153, 161, 158, 154/155 six times, 160 twice. A few more years elapsed during the work on Book VI and VII and new material was steadily taken into consideration. Characteristic is the case of the horoscope p. 284,12 to p. 285,3. The child was born on Aug. 14, 158 as can be concluded from the planetary positions of its horoscope. But "because it was still an infant" Vettius Valens now asks for critical months instead of critical years as in the other cases. The reason is clear: this birth took place in the period of his working on these chapters. After the short span of 33 months of a much troubled life, the poor creature died in May 161, just early enough to have this fact properly explained by our author.

Another instance from this chapter is worth mentioning. It is easy to see that the data given in the horoscope on p. 282,16-27 cannot be satisfied astronomically for centuries before and after the time of Vettius Valens. But since 54 years of life are recorded in this case and since the latest date in this chapter is 164 we need only investigate the years close to 110. Indeed, computing the positions of the planets for 110 (Dec. 15) we find perfect agreement with all data of the horoscope except for Jupiter, and everything is correct if we read "Jupiter (and) Venus in Capricorn" instead of "Jupiter in Virgo, Venus in Capricorn." This also explains why Venus is mentioned out of order before Mars and right after Jupiter.

5. Using all cases where we find data from the life of a person whose horoscope can be dated astronomically, we obtain a neat chronology for the composition of the "Anthologiae." Books III, IV, and V up to chapter 10 were written in succession between 152 and 159; then follows Book VII, with dates up to 165. Book VIII furnishes explicitly quoted dates, the majority of which belong to the period from Trajan 6 (A.D. 102) to Antoninus 21 (A.D. 157), plus recorded events until A.D. 157 (in VIII,6) and A.D. 166 (in VIII,7).

The remaining books, as far as datable horoscopes are concerned, show a different character. Here we no longer have at our disposal information beyond the constellation at birth. Nevertheless the computed dates of about 40 horoscopes in Book II show a clear tendency. About half of them belong to the time from A.D. 50 to 100, the rest do not go beyond 120. It seems plausible to consider this as an indication of the

use of earlier records, though caution is necessary: in VII,2 a horoscope from II,21 for A.D. 74 is re-used, showing that this person lived 79 years, i.e., to 153/154.

A second early group, though unfortunately a very small one, is found in V,11 and 12. Here we have four horoscopes whose dates are A.D. 37, 68, 92, and 104. I do not dare to form an opinion as to whether or not it is significant that these chapters quote Critodemus.

6. There remain the very latest dates which may or may not be "additamenta vetustissima." In III,16 we have two horoscopes for 102 May 1 and April 30 (perhaps actually only variants) recording a death in 169. Similarly VI,5 leads from 132 to 185. In VII,3 we have a horoscope for 173 and finally, against all expectation, one for 188 in II,26.

7. I think it is clear from the preceding preliminary survey that one can safely conclude that Vettius Valens wrote the bulk of his work in the decade from A.D. 152 to 162, using earlier material in the earlier books and perhaps making a few additions in later years.

The mutual independence of the Anthology and the Tetrabiblos appears now in a new light. Ptolemy's own observations, quoted in the *Almagest*, range between A.D. 127 and 141. Since the *Tetrabiblos*, by its own statement, was written after the *Almagest*, one may well imagine that the two most influential astrological treatises were written practically simultaneously: Vettius Valens eagerly collecting material from his files of "case histories" to confirm and refine the ever growing doctrine, Ptolemy shaping a consistent theory of what appeared to him to be a universal science of life.

But more important than the question of priority is the problem of the early chronology of Hellenistic and Roman astrology. It is now clear that the direct sources of Vettius Valens do not lead back beyond the middle of the first century A.D. This, by and large, is the same limit which still exists for us today for actually preserved horoscopes on papyrus.

O. NEUGEBAUER

